The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXIX JANUARY, 1944 No. 4

A REVISIONIST APPROACH TO HISPANIC AMERICAN STUDIES *

I AM inclined to believe that times like those in which we live are not particularly propitious for papers which are purely erudite or which deal with historical problems, interesting in themselves, but somewhat remote from the realities of the day. Dr. Martin R. P. McGuire in his address last year on this same occasion performed a useful and necessary task in calling our attention once more to certain questions of historical interest in the world in which we live, which need to be treated again and again. I believe that the situation this year is no different, and for this reason I have chosen as the topic for my presidential address the problem of revisionism in the approach to the history of the Hispanic American peoples. I mean by revisionism something quite simple: the need for readjusting our interpretation of the realities of Hispanic America, and, more particularly, the definite need for revamping certain concepts which I believe have warped and distorted much of our understanding of that area.

I have chosen this topic of Hispanic America for two reasons: first, because it happens to be the special field of interest to which I have devoted some slight attention during the past years; and secondly, because the knowledge of that area is part and parcel of the present foreign policy of this country and must remain so

* Presidential Address delivered at the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, New York City, December 29, 1943.

no matter what modifications may be adopted in the future. The international interests of the United States are bound up in a peculiarly intimate way with those of the other American republics and even our most rabid isolationists, whose vision of the world is limited by the dimensions of their county or electoral district, have come to the point where America means something more than Nebraska or Iowa. It is encouraging that this particular sector of public opinion has come to include the other republics of this hemisphere in their conception of the area of legitimate American interest. The recent controversy aroused in this country and abroad by the declarations of Senator Hugh Butler reveal that sooner or later the Latin American policy is bound to become a debatable issue. The controversy about its merits cannot be long delayed. The so-called policy of the Good Neighbor which has flourished for these past thirteen years has probably won more universal approval than almost any other single aspect of foreign policy under any of our presidential administrations. That does not mean, to be sure, that it will not be submitted to the most severe criticism. The accusations against it will be the same as those levelled against the domestic policy of the present executive and against his alleged "interventionism", the term so commonly applied to the almost clairvoyant ability of the President to grasp the implications of the world conditions under which we are now living. For this reason, I am convinced that we are destined definitely to be deeply concerned about Latin America. The area, which prior to 1900 figured so slightly in our international thinking, will certainly acquire increasing importance through the years as one of the pivotal points of the foreign policy of the United States.

If this is true, then it is obviously important that as historians we learn to find our way through the historical evolution of the twenty peoples who constitute the other American republics. I do not know if my colleagues in this particular field agree with me or not, but I am quite convinced that the manner of presentation of the essential elements in the history of these people to our American students leaves a great deal to be desired. I would go further and say that I doubt if any other field of current historical interest is presented so badly, ineffectively, or less interestingly.

The greater portion of the texts in this field which circulate are enough to deaden even the liveliest interest in what is essentially a fairly interesting field. Curiously enough, in almost every other aspect of historical scholarship we have gone far beyond the point where history meant politics and politics means the change of presidential administrations and the various and sundry activities of the persons who happened to hold high office at a given moment. Latin American history has not gone much beyond this as yet. I have claimed for a long time that of all the arid, uninspiring, and fundamentally useless subjects to which the attention of a student may be drawn, none can equal the political histories of the Hispanic American republics. In the first place they are all alike and can be reduced merely to an endless chronology of names, dates, and changes. I see no point in giving more than the most cursory attention to such phenomena as the rise and fall, change and reshifting of presidents in Paraguay, Honduras, or Guatemala. The same may be said of the constitutions. I recall a correspondence I had some years ago with a gentleman who was on his way to Bolivia to study the constitutional history of that republic. I am afraid that I replied to his letter in a somewhat facetious vein, stating that I found it difficult to understand why anyone would waste his time and a foundation's money in the study of something that was so theoretical and unrealistic as the constitutions of Bolivia. None of them ever fitted the needs of the country, all of them have been more or less bad translations of similar documents somewhere else, and few of them have been seriously put into practice. As a real historical problem, the study of the constitutions of that country would give one no insight whatsoever into the life, vicissitudes, and character of the Bolivian people. I cite this example merely to introduce the topic of this paper, namely, that it is high time we gave some attention to the realities of Latin America and reappraised and re-evaluated many of the attitudes and approaches which heretofore have been conventional and stereotyped. An intelligent Latin American policy in the United States depends on such an appraisal. We have made remarkably little progress in this direction. We have

been content to repeat the usual things, stress the usual points and inflict on our students a type of Latin American history which is enough to make them gag. I suggested a moment ago that in the long run the policy of America in this field depends in large measure on the type of information our people get concerning the other American peoples. I would propose that there are two very broad assumptions which inevitably lead to serious confusion. The first is to pattern the history of Latin America on that of the United States or, to express it better, to employ the United States as a pattern or model or background against which to set the evolution of these peoples. The second error in orientation, to which reference has already been made, is to assign to political events and developments the same importance that is given them in the United States or Great Britain.

The history of the other American republics is full of the same nomenclature as that of the United States. Constitution, amendments, congress, bill of rights, president, cabinet, etc., all the terms are there and the assumption is that they mean the same thing. We suffer the illusion of an apparent similarity when the reality is very different. It is perfectly evident that while the external trappings of republican government and of constitutional practice have been the same, the basic realities underlying that surface are so different as to belong to another world. In the name of continental solidarity and hemispheric unity, we should not commit the error of ascribing similarities that do not exist or analogies that are only apparent. I suggest that Latin American history be approached as something *sui generis*, the analogies of which with either Europe or the United States are only slight. Latin America is, in reality, something absolutely novel in the modern world. No other entire continent in modern times has broken away from its colonial ties to constitute itself as independent. No other area as vast can be found anywhere in which three major races have mixed their bloods and sought to develop nationalities which are based on the most complete and wide-spread miscegenation. No other area of the world of similar proportions possesses the same essentially uniform culture, language, and religion. In other words, neither Europe nor the United States provide a successful counter-

part to explain the internal and intimate development of these peoples.

For this and other reasons, I believe that political history is the least important aspect in the study of Latin America. We are only beginning to have access to information extensive enough to form accurate judgments on the social, economic, and cultural history of the area. I believe much of the disrespect for the Latin Americans which unquestionably exists in the United States emanates from this idea that their politics are tumultuous and anarchical, their constitutions mere pieces of paper, and their presidents subject to ejection periodically by violent means. In other words, the criterion of political maturity has been set up as the one measure of appraisal. Nothing could be more erroneous. It is true that Latin American politics has followed this general course, but underneath this turbulent exterior are forces of stability, normality, and progress which have flourished in spite of the political crust which is so given to this constant heaving.

Suppose we examine now a number of specific points or aspects of the history of Hispanic America which I believe require reanalysis and reexamination. I should say that the first are the terms republicanism and democracy. The terms are hard enough to define anywhere and are particularly so when applied to peoples of diverse origin and experience. Is Latin America since independence in 1825 democratic in the sense that we use the word? Has republicanism, which is the visible form of government, actually taken root as the type of political organization most responsive to the needs of the people concerned? Did those nations which adopted for a longer or a shorter period of time the monarchical system commit a hopeless folly or did they reveal a sense of political intuition unequalled by those who were carried away by the vision of republican institutions? I would propose these as problems of a very fundamental nature which ought to be examined quite candidly and objectively, since they are underlying premises to much that we are saying and thinking today in terms of inter-American relations.

It goes without saying that we have given the word democracy a most limited meaning. I wonder if we do not mean frequently

merely the privilege of going to the polls on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of each November 4 to deposit our vote for this or that candidate. If this is the case, I dare say that Latin America is far from approaching anything like democracy. However in the broader sense which includes very definitely the social and economic, Latin America has something fairly positive to offer. It would be encouraging to have much more attention concentrated on the achievements in the way of social democracy in as vast and complex a country as Brazil, where racial assimilation has made great progress, rather than on this superficial and irrelevant emphasis on the democratic structure of the Hispanic American republics.

A problem which merits the most serious attention is that of the nature of the institutions in the light of the *milieu*, experience, and character of the people. Extravagant romanticists of the type of Juan Montalvo of Ecuador have tended to insist that there are ideal forms of political and social life which should be adopted regardless of the peculiar conditions which may prevail in a given country. The problem of whether republicanism was adequate after the confusion and welter of the wars of emancipation is both pertinent and even actual. We in America have a curious and often unexplainable complex about the word monarchy. We are possessed with the idea that if a government calls itself republican and elects a president it is necessarily more benevolent, more responsive to public will, and in general more basically representative than if monarchical. One of the problems that has long intrigued me, however, is the comparison between monarchical Brazil and Spanish America as a study in contrast between the prematurity and precipitateness of republicanism and the logical transition from colony to monarchy. The problem is full of interesting possibilities which ought to be explored. For a long time the name of Agustin de Iturbide has been anthema to the conventional and official historians of Mexico primarily because he did not believe in a republic as the source of all blessings. It will be recalled that this extraordinary leader, the real founder of Mexico as such, stated his case cogently and pithily under three principles: monarchism, union of Mexicans and Spaniards, and the recognition

of the Catholic faith as dominant. This relatively simple program, lacking completely in republican eloquence, and known as the Plan of Agula, constituted, it seems to me, a fairly reasonable basis for the existence of independent Mexico in 1821. Nevertheless the name of Iturbide has been erased from Mexican history, and his reputation besmirched as the representative of intrigue, unbriddled ambition, and political chicanery. I suggest that here one has a type of problem that demands revision because of the conventionalized interpretation that has been given the course of events.

Another phase of Hispanic American history which certainly demands an attitude of revisionism is the whole period of independence. Reams of paper have been devoted to almost every aspect of the military, political, and diplomatic history of this time. I submit, however, that the really important problems have been treated very inadequately, if at all. What was the real object of the independence movement in Hispanic America? What were the currents at work within the vast confines of Mexico, Central and South America before 1810? What did most of the responsible leaders actually want for their peoples? Was the movement motivated by animosity against Spain and the Spanish as is usually depicted?

In posing these questions, we are striking, of course, at the basic problems of the historical interpretation of all of the Americas discovered and colonized by Spain. The process of revisionism in the case of the colonial period has made and continues to make satisfactory progress. Item by item, piece by piece, the framework of a valid and authentic interpretation is being built up. The extremely important studies of Dr. Irving Leonard of the University of Michigan in revealing the very active commerce in books with Spanish America helps to overcome once and for all the myth of the obscurantism of the Spanish colonies in the new world. The vehement and often impassioned studies of Father Constantino Bayle in Spain, in spite of their obvious efforts to make a case, do shed valuable light on the education and intellectual situation in the colonies. It would be out of place to cite name after name of those who have contributed to this task. I am more concerned in

this paper with the nineteenth century in Hispanic America. It is important however, in the name of historical continuity to recognize that revisionism must start at the beginning. So much mythology and legend have accumulated that the task is singularly difficult. The motives and even the chronology of the wars of independence demand a careful reorientation. The studies of the Frenchman, Marius André, set the pace for a very fundamental revisionism in showing that the wars were very far from being the result of the influence of the French Revolution and its ideas and were rather a serious and coordinated effort against it.

The same may be said of the role of the clergy in these vast movements. If anything requires a revision in thinking and in appraisal it is the place and influence of the Catholic clergy in almost every aspect of the national life of the Latin American states. We are still under the influence of those who have classified people as belonging to two classes: liberals, who have a monopoly on all phases of forward thinking; and reactionaries, who constitute all of those whom the liberals do not like. This facile classification has colored very definitely much of the writing on Hispanic America. How many of our current texts give any other picture of the wars of independence than as a movement of enlightenment against forces which sought to keep the colonies in bondage, and among those forces were, of course, the aristocracy, the clergy, and the privileged minorities? Where do we find reference specifically to the fact that practically all of the great leaders of this emancipation were aristocrats and that the clergy and hierarchy were divided in sentiment as they are likely to be in almost every similar case. When will it be possible to convince others, that we, as Catholics, in spite of our dogmatic unity, do have the right to disagree on innumerable matters, and that perhaps the tragedy often is that we agree on so very few things. Possibly if the restrictions were really there we might more ably present a united front at times when it is so badly needed. And so it happened at the beginning of the last century throughout Hispanic America. The Bishop of Quito presided over a revolutionary committee; the Bishop of Pasto in southern New Granada, check by jowl, so to speak, with his Granadine colleague, was a violent and unrepentant royalist. The famous Congress of

Tucuman in the Argentine provinces in 1816 has been labelled correctly as almost a theological assembly, so prominent was the influence of the clergy and so decisive its prestige. Time does not permit a listing of many similar cases. I merely bring these particular problems to your attention to emphasize my thesis, namely, that it is time we recheck ideas about such important epochs as the independence of Hispanic America, because from this period stems almost everything that distinguishes and characterizes the nineteenth century.

Together with the questions I have just suggested there are others to which attention might be called and which are equally subject to a revisionist attitude: the problem of foreign influence at work, and the state of economic and political affairs in Spanish America when the wars broke out. Much has been said of French influence and little has been said of the tremendous influence of Jeremy Bentham. Latin America has always been subject to exotic influence that often find more fertile soil in these countries than in the country of their origin. It is no accident that positivism flourished in Brazil after Auguste Compte was no longer read by anyone except graduate students working on their dissertations. It is no accident either that Marxism, undiluted or in emasculated form, has managed to win considerable audiences in Hispanic America. The movement of ideas is a most intriguing phase of the political, social, and intellectual history of this area during the past century. Full of anachronisms, misapplications, and distortions, one is apt to find survivals which are almost folkloristic in character.

The state of Spanish America in 1810 is still open to every type of analysis. It is strange that as important a point as this should still remain unelucidated in spite of these many years of concern with the problem. I submit, nevertheless, that what Albert Mathiez did for the France of 1789 ought to be done for Hispanic America. After all these years of believing that France on the eve of the Revolution was in a state of virtual chaos economically, we discover now that this was not the case at all. We are presented convincing evidence that the economic life of France, if somewhat disjointed, was at least potentially capable of a healthy reaction and far from the collapse which has generally been depicted.

Would that more of our students of Hispanic American affairs would read Alexander von Humboldt. Unhappily these older writers are little read in our days. Yet somehow I am convinced that Humboldt must know more about the New Spain of the first decade of the nineteenth century than almost any of those who came after him. We should begin this necessary revisionism by revising the books we read and the authors we consult.

I spoke a few moments ago of the difficult problem of evaluating the place of the clergy and of the Church. The nineteenth century is the perfect example of the incomprehension of this problem and its implications. The liberal, conservative tradition has done incalculable harm in this respect by confusing the issue and by making clear judgments more difficult. I would not deny, of course, that we have had our share of responsibility in this confusion. However, I would urge that the religious problem be considered as one of the first to require careful and patient reexamination. How much attention, for example, is devoted in our texts to the problem of the *Patronato Real*? One may say that this is no more than an academic problem belonging to the past centuries with no reality and no warmth of actuality. I would say that there is no single problem more extraordinarily actual than this, because on its understanding depends almost every aspect of the Church, the State in its relations to the Church, and the problem of religion and religious influence in Hispanic America in general.

Everything that the Church was and did in Hispanic America rested definitely on this juridical basis. The royal patronage, which developed from the period of the reconquest in the Iberian peninsula, determined the existence of the Church in America and set up the conditions under which it was to evangelize the new world. The interference of the State in almost every phase of ecclesiastical life was no accident but the consequence of definite legal regulations. The assertion of the independent governments that the new regimes had the same rights and privileges as the Spanish crown set the stage for many of the internecine struggles in the past century into which the Church was definitely drawn. The claims and counterclaims regarding the application of the *Patronato*

and its legality is the basis of much of the anti-clericalism which has distinguished the history of all too many of the republics. It is indispensable to understand these legal intricacies. To dismiss them as merely quibbling or the wrangling of jurists over minute and subtle points of interpretation is to miss the significance of the issue entirely. I would almost go so far as to assert that the best introduction to the study of the history of Hispanic America is some knowledge of Spanish law and jurisprudence. As a people peculiarly gifted with a love of juridical dialectics, an appreciation of the place of the legal codes and institutions in all phases of the national life is extremely useful. I would go even further and say that if I were to choose the works which I believe to be absolutely essential to the understanding of the realities of the mind and temperament of the Latin American peoples, I would, without hesitation, select the *Quijote* and the *Siete Partidas*. Neither belong to America and both do. What may appear to you to be a flippancy or an attempt at a *bon mot* involves a very real truth. Hispanic America has been dominated by the heritage and tradition of Spain. The *Patronato* is an excellent example. Yet, how little is it studied or even mentioned except in passing and, as a result what do we have? An enormous preoccupation with the deleterious influence of the Church, with its incapacity to respond to the times, its conservatism and its deadening influence on the social development of the peoples. Instead of clarifying the singularly unsatisfactory relations of Church and State in the period under discussion, which led, not to the supremacy and domination of the Church as is commonly believed, but to the exact contrary, i. e., to its subjection to the State in every detail of its life, much ink and effort are devoted to enumerating the number of monasteries and adding up the alleged wealth of the Church in terms of properties. Instead of recognizing that in the fields of education and human welfare the Church bore the almost exclusive burden for centuries, the accusation is made that the Church did not do enough and it was high time that the State, heretofore largely indifferent to the whole problem, be given charge. The enumeration of these problems could go on indefinitely. Time is too

short to do more than call your attention to the place of revisionism in a field which has become increasingly popular, but which still is an almost virgin forest which is yet to be penetrated.

The study of Hispanic American history in the United States is certainly far from satisfactory. It is not without importance to note that in spite of the tremendous interest evinced in this field during the past five or six years, that scarcely a single book of permanent importance has been published. I do not refer to the popular and semi-popular tracts that describe the production of rubber in the Acre territory or the number of Nazi airfields in Colombia, but serious works that will stand the test of the next few years and will be permanent contributions to our knowledge of Hispanic America. It is a sad commentary that in general we are not raising up the type of penetrating scholar to cope with these and a multitude of other problems. There are, of course, notable and praiseworthy exceptions, but, on the whole, I see no reason for us to be content with the work being done. I attribute it in part to the absurd division of work according to "fields". If any word has come to have a positively obnoxious connotation it is the word "field". Unfortunately it means in the world of scholarship exactly what it means in agriculture—a fencing off of a piece of land in which the individual works without curiosity or desire to penetrate beyond. Not only does the individual establish himself behind his little self-erected fence, to the cultivation of whose soil he devotes himself with more or less profit, but he acquires a singularly proprietary feeling which resents the appearance of any other individual who may desire to till the same piece of land. Hence we have the inevitable consequence of this parcelling and fractioning of the whole area. We have monographs and dissertations and articles and studies and no vision. We have footnotes and no intuition. We have a breakdown with no synthesis. We have the isolated without the complete.

Jacques Maritain has recently remarked that we in the United States have limitless energy and boundless zest for achievement but we are lacking in contemplation and intuition. I feel very keenly that in the Hispanic field we have lost the sense of intuition, if indeed we ever had it, and have substituted for it the product of

industry which leaves us with material but no understanding. We might well reflect that we have not come so very far from the days of Prescott, Irving, or Ticknor.

I think much of the fault lies in our exaggerated sense of the scholarly. We are afraid to be labelled as amateurs and dilletantes. We are afraid to reveal a thought about anything that is outside the specific, restricted area in which we have published a treatise and in which we are judged supreme. I wonder if we do not often select a field in which to reign unchallenged that is so arid and so sterile, that no one else has the slightest desire to enter it? Whatever may be the case, and I am referring concretely to the study of Hispanic America, there must come a change in this attitude or we are destined to continue producing without enriching, digging without extracting, learning without understanding. The Hispanic field is a unit as is every other. We who are supposed to be Hispanists strive to understand and interpret to our students, or other innocents, some sense of what the Hispanic peoples are like and what their culture means in the world. Nothing is more difficult than the interpretation of the culture of a people or its genius by a non-national. None of the various disciplines to which we devote ourselves can be strictly separated. For this reason, I believe profoundly that in order to advance the cause of Hispanic scholarship in this country, we urgently need more synthesis and less analysis. We cannot continue to guard zealously these mutually exclusive domains and still retain any hope of achieving a real *rapprochement*.

Language, letters, history, and thought are all part of the same thing. How discouraging it is to find those who occupy themselves with Hispanic history and have never read a Hispanic American novel. How equally disconcerting are those who belong to the fraternity of students of literature and find ample satisfaction in the heaping up of bibliographical chits with no inkling or even curiosity about what is in the books so recorded. How many of those who count the number of times a given author uses *lo* or *le* have any real enthusiasm for the content of the author so dissected? How many of those who are diligent in pursuing the minute fact,

in determining where a given personage lodged on a given night, have any sense of the social and economic forces that are at work in Hispanic America? How many are there among our Hispanic Americanists who attempt to grasp the spiritual and permanent values in the culture of the nation which gave birth to these new nationalities, Spain itself?

If the relations of our country with the other American republics are to be based on something more than maudlin sentimentality, if the exigencies of the present moments are to produce lasting and mutually satisfactory relations that will endure after the conclusion of the war, it behooves us logically to re-examine the past of the peoples, with whom we are dealing, to evaluate their history, and rid ourselves of many of the misconceptions we have acquired. This task means that a salutary revision of our interpretation of Hispanic American history is indispensable and urgent. It should be accompanied by this larger task, which is directly the obligation of those of us who belong to the world of scholarship, to think in broader terms and see things as a whole. As Catholic historians this obligation is almost peremptory, for of all the segments of our population we, implicitly, belong to the most universal.

RICHARD PATTEE

National Catholic Welfare Conference

THE ORIGINS OF ANTI-PAPAL LEGISLATION IN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY SCOTLAND

IN the study of the history of mediaeval England, the story of that country's anti-papal legislation during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is well known. The statutes of *Provisors* and *Praemunire* have been properly regarded as signs of England's growing feeling of independence in matters ecclesiastical. They are seen to be the forerunners of the religious revolution forced upon the country by Henry VIII. Thus an understanding of these laws restraining papal power in England is necessary for an appreciation of the background of the English Reformation.

In the study of the Scottish Reformation, however, the situation is somewhat different. Anti-papal legislation is usually ignored when the origins of Scotland's religious revolution are discussed. Yet from the number of laws enacted in Scotland before 1500 for the purpose of curtailing papal power, it would seem that they must have been of some importance. They are the fifteenth-century expression of Scottish opposition to papal interference in the national church. By 1520, however, anti-papal legislation practically disappears. The Scots had won the battle, and the Papacy was willing to let them control their ecclesiastical organization as they saw fit. Yet this result had not been attained without struggle, in which the enactments of parliament bore an important part.

When reference is made to Scottish anti-papal statutes it is usually asked if the comparable English legislation had any influence upon them. That it did so, is extremely doubtful. While the Scottish church often copied the laws and customs of the English church, the state seems to have paid less attention to the enactments of the English government. There is no indication of any connection between English and Scottish anti-papal laws. They are not similar in form, and with the exception of *Provisors* they seem to deal with different problems. Moreover, the fact that all the major English statutes were enacted in the fourteenth century, while

Scottish legislation does not appear until the next century, would also seem to indicate that they had no connection.

A better explanation of the development of Scotland's anti-papal laws is that they grew naturally out of the situation within the country. The conflict between the State and the Papacy came not from a desire to imitate England, but from the Scottish political developments during the fifteenth century.

One of the underlying causes of this struggle was, no doubt, the rise of Scottish nationalism. During the War of Independence, in the early part of the fourteenth century, Scottish national feeling had become strong. This affected even the Church, and for twenty-five years it ignored the Papacy, which supported English attempts to conquer Scotland. While this nationalism continued down to the time of the Reformation, by 1400 it had changed its appearance. It had become the tool of whatever group controlled the government, and was exploited for that group's benefit. Therefore, we must look for other causes than pure nationalism when studying the origins of the Scots' anti-papal statutes.

The principal reason for the opposition of the Scottish crown and barons to papal control of the Church was their desire to use the Church's wealth for their own benefit. Since it was the largest landowner in Scotland, the Church naturally was of considerable economic and political importance. Consequently whenever the nobles or the crown needed money, the natural object of their desire was the wide church lands. This situation in turn involved the Church in political affairs. The wealth and the armed forces which it could supply to anyone it favored made it an important pawn in the unending contest for political power. Neither nobles nor king, however, could gain much influence over the church's wealth and resources as long as it was under the direct supervision of the papacy. Not until the secular powers could place their favorites in the major benefices and prelacies would they be able to control matters. To attain this end either the pope's permission had to be obtained, or the pope's power broken. As the first of the alternatives was not always possible, the second was usually regarded as the better. Out of this came Scotland's anti-papal legislation. In no other way

could the Church be brought under secular domination and made subservient to the interests of domestic politics. Thus, whenever a pope refused to fulfill the wishes of the party in power in Scotland, anti-papal legislation resulted.

During the early years of the fifteenth century there was little antagonism between the papacy and the Scots. The Great Schism then at its height made it impolitic for either the Roman or the Avignon pope to offend possible adherents. The able and unscrupulous Robert, Duke of Albany, who dominated the councils of his weaker brother Robert III, was able therefore to deal with the Church much as he pleased. Thus, when in 1401 he forbade any ecclesiastical appeals to go to the papal curia until the Schism was ended, he experienced little papal opposition. Even to such a flagrant rejecting of papal authority neither Benedict XIII nor Gregory XII dared to take exception.[1] In 1406 Albany became regent of Scotland on the death of his brother the king. The lawful heir was a minor and a prisoner in England, and so Albany could govern as he pleased. With the aid of the Earl of Douglas he proceeded to rule as though he were king. As the division of the Church had so weakened the papacy that it could exercise little authority in Scotland, he distributed ecclesiastical benefices and favors with the prodigality of one who spends another's hard-earned money. Albany was always sure of the pope's acquiescence in his treatment of the Church for he supported Benedict XIII, who was gradually losing most of his adherents to the Council of Constance and its pope, Martin V. Benedict's precarious position made it imperative that he should humor the Scottish ruler. Thus until 1418, when Scotland like the others forsook Benedict, Albany was allowed to treat the Church much as he pleased.[2]

With Scotland's acceptance of Martin V as pope, the situation changed. Now there was only one pontiff and he was well able to rule. This difference was reflected in the ecclesiastical affairs of

[1] R. K. Hannay, "James I, Bishop Cameron and the Papacy," *Scottish Historical Review*, XV (1918), 191.

[2] For a fuller treatment of this period, cf. W. Stanford Reid, "Scotland and the Church Councils of the Fifteenth Century," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXIX (1943), 1ff.

Scotland. The amount of papal revenues collected, the number of benefices reserved for papal provision and the number of actual appointments by the pope to Scottish vacancies took a sudden leap upwards.[3] Papal intervention in the Scottish church increased in spite of the effort of the regent, the Douglases and other nobles, and the conciliar party among the clergy. While at first they had been only too willing to seek papal graces from Martin, by 1424 the Scots, both nobility and clergy, were becoming tired of the continual assertion of papal authority. The pope did not always do as they wished. Therefore, in retaliation they frequently refused to obey his orders.[4] To this confusion, the weakness of Murdoch Stewart, the new regent (1420-1424), added another element. He would take no steps to restrain the pope. Thus until James I returned from his captivity in England real anti-papal legislation was non-existent.

In the spring of 1424, the king came "back to his own," and a few weeks later he convened the Scottish Estates. The result was an immediate appearance of anti-papal statutes. That the Estates should take such a step is not entirely strange. Scots were becoming so opposed to the papacy that they were prepared when the occasion arose to take steps to curtail papal influence in Scotland. The looked-for opportunity came in 1424. The Estates needed money, for the king's ransom had to be paid. Therefore, a general tax was imposed upon the "hail kinryk" in order to meet the payments due to England. Included in those called upon to pay the tax were the Scottish clergy.[5]

To make sure that the clergy would be able to fulfill their responsibilities with regard to the general tax, a law was enacted to keep

[3] J. H. Cockburn, "Papal Collections and Collectors in Scotland in the Middle Ages," *Records of the Scot. Ch. Hist. Soc.*, I, 195-6; *Calendar of Papal Registers, Letters* (London, 1906), VII, 6ff; *Calendar of Scottish Supplications to Rome*, E. R. Lindsay and A. I. Cameron, edd., (Edinburgh, 1934), pp. 116, 162, 163.

[4] Reid, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-12.

[5] *The Acts of the Parliament of Scotand*, T. Thomson, ed. (Edinburg, 1814), II, 4; Hector Boece, *Hystory and Croniklis*, J. Bellenden, ed. (Edinburgh, 1519), p. ccxliv; J. Dowden, "The Appointment of Bishops in Scotland during the Medieval Period," *Scot. Hist. Rev.*, VII (1910), 8; Hannay, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

them from going to Rome in search of preferment. This was followed by a second statute forbidding the clergy to seek or to hold any pension out of any benefice within the realm.[6] By this means, it was hoped, the clergy would be prevented from exporting funds to the delapidation of their benefices and the harm of the country. James and his barons were determined to keep the Scottish ecclesiastical revenues at home. It was not a matter of having absentee foreigners provided to Scottish benefices, but rather one of making sure that the State would be able to tax the Church for its own purposes.

Although these statutes were no mere expressions of hope, efforts seem to have been made to reconcile the pope to the new situation. Embassies were dispatched to Rome for this purpose. Some believe that they were given the task of persuading the pope to grant Scotland a concordat, in return for which the anti-papal laws would be repealed. If this is so, little came of the envoys' efforts.[7] Although the pope granted James I various privileges, he was unwilling to give in on the crucial point. He would not relinquish his right to provide to Scottish benefices.[8] The Scots, on the other hand, were determined that he should. Thus negotiations remained in a deadlock.

In 1426 another law was placed on the statute book, but whether or not it was aimed at the pope is hard to say. It made the definite statement that all Scots were to be governed "undir the kingis lawis and statutis of this realme alanerly and undir na particular lawis na special privileges na be na lawis of uthir cuntreis na realmis."[9] This may have been a denial of papal authority and the forerunner of a statute promulgated the following year. By the latter an attempt was made to curtail the powers of ecclesiastical courts. In cases where the plaintiff in a suit involving a cleric

[6] *APS*, II, 5.

[7] E. W. M. Balfour-Melville, *James I, King of Scots*, (London, 1937), pp. 138, 139; *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland in the Public Record Office*, J. Bain, ed. (Edinburgh, 1888), IV, no. 979.

[8] *CPR*, VII, 30; Balfour-Melville, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-140.

[9] *APS*, II, 9, *c*, 3.

was a layman, the judgment was to be rendered within forty days and no frivolous appeals were to be allowed.[10] The purpose for which this law was enacted seems to have been, like the others, largely financial. It was stated specifically that the government desired to curtail the expenses and vexations of the poor. But the clause against frivolous appeals also struck at the power and pocketbook of the papal curia, the Church's court of final reference. Thus this statute became another weapon in the state's armory being prepared for possible conflict with the pope.[11]

In the same year further action was taken to keep the clergy from going to Rome in search of benefices. A law was enacted which forbade clerks to leave the kingdom without first informing the chancellor of the amount of money which they wished to export. Two years later every clerk going to the papal curia had to promise to refrain from "barratry"—the Scots' term for obtaining a benefice at Rome. Moreover, it was ordained that since some Scots were already in Rome for that purpose, no one was to send money to them, nor was anyone to favor or aid them when they returned.[12] Every possible effort was being made to restrict papal provisions to Scottish benefices.

All these statutes seem to have received baronial approbation. The nobles realized that they might be used for their benefit as well as for the purpose of helping to pay the king's ransom. If benefices were filled in Scotland rather than in Rome, they could usually exert pressure upon those who elected or chose incumbents in order that their own friends and relatives might have the preference. In this way they could place in key ecclesiastical positions

[10] *Ibid.*, II, 14, *c.* 5.

[11] It is not easy to be certain, but it would seem that this law may have had clerical support, if it was not actually originated by the provincial council. There is a difference on this point among historians. Cf. Geo. MacKenzie, *Observations on the Acts of Parliament* (Edinburgh, 1687), p. 20; Hannay, *op. cit.*, p. 190; Balfour-Melville, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-3; A. Bellesheim, *A History of the Catholic Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1887), II, 62; D. Patrick, ed., *Statutes of the Scottish Church* (Edinburgh, 1907), p. xxxix; Jas. Rimrose, *Medieval Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1913), p. 65.

[12] *APS*, II, 14, *c.* 2; 16, *c.* 9.

those who would co-operate with them, and use the Church's wealth and power for their benefit. No doubt it was because of this that the most powerful feudal faction in the country, the house of Douglas, was to be found among the leaders of the anti-papal group. It would be entirely to their advantage if the papacy's power in Scotland were curtailed; for they would then be able to control without opposition the monasteries, priories, and benefices within their own lands.

It was probably because of the Douglas interest in the matter that John Cameron, Bishop of Glasgow, became the leader of the anti-papal movement. Before James I returned to Scotland, Cameron had been private secretary and confessor to the Earl of Wigton, who succeeded to the earldom of Douglas in 1424. No doubt as a result of his friendship with the young Douglas Cameron became royal secretary, then Keeper of the Privy Seal, and within the two following years both Bishop of Glasgow and Chancellor of Scotland. Provided by the pope to Glasgow as a result of royal support, it is not surprising that Cameron was in favor of keeping the power of appointment to benefices within the country. If our accounts of him are correct, he seems to have gained his office not so much by piety of life as by his political ability. Thus he would not favor papal interference in the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland.[13]

That Cameron was regarded as the person responsible for the Scottish anti-papal laws is shown by the actions of the papacy. Through Cardinal Beaufort of England an attempt was made to have James change his policy; but nothing was accomplished.[14] The pope then ordered that an investigation be made of Cameron's conduct. The bishop was summoned to Rome to explain why the anti-papal laws had been enacted. At this point, however, a major error was made. The summoner was a certain William Croyser, Archdeacon of Teviotdale, who was not only the leading Scottish pluralist in Rome, but was also a personal foe of the Bishop of

[13] C. Cowan, *The Lord Chancellors of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1911), I, 177; Wm. Fraser, *The Douglas Book* (Edinburgh, 1885), III, 51; *CPR*, VII, 478.

[14] T. Rymer, *Foedera, Conventiones et Acta Publica etc.* (Hagae, 1740), IV: iv, 141; G. Burnett, *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1880), IV, ciii; *Rotuli Scotiae* (London, 1814), II, 264.

Glasgow. The result can be well imagined. When Croyser arrived in Scotland, Cameron was in England on diplomatic business. Nevertheless Croyser went ahead with the publication of the summons. James was so annoyed at this highhanded action that Croyser had to leave the country as quickly as possible in order to save his own skin. Since he was charged with treason, his numerous Scottish benefices were then taken into the king's hands.[15]

James attempted to settle matters by sending two envoys, John, Bishop of Brechin, and Alexander Lawder, Archdeacon of Dunkeld, to Rome. They were instructed to appease the pope concerning the act abridging secular causes in ecclesiastical courts, at the same time offering excuses for Cameron who, because he was chancellor, was too busy to go to the curia. The Scottish king, however, somewhat foolishly instructed his two representatives to cite Croyser to appear before him in Scotland to answer the charges of treason. Only after considerable negotiation were affairs settled, at least temporarily. James dropped his charges against Croyser, and the pope forgave Cameron on condition that he would exert his influence to have the objectionable laws repealed.[16]

Shortly after this compromise was reached, the Council of Basle convened. As the anti-papal laws had not been repealed, and there was no likelihood that they would be, it was only natural that the Scots should support this body which was dedicated, practically from its opening session, to the task of curtailing papal power. Yet King James was not to be won over to the council too easily. With true Scottish canniness he decided to see whether the pope or the council would offer the better terms. Therefore, while he dispatched Cameron to Rome, he also sent other officials to Basle. By this means he seems to have hoped to find out which side was the more open to suggestions. As it soon became clear that Pope Eugene would not give in to Scottish demands, Cameron was re-

[15] *CPR*, VIII, 287; Primrose, *op. cit.*, p. 67; Balfour-Melville, *op. cit.*, p. 174; *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis* (Maitland Club, 1843), II, 319; J. Dowden, *The Medieval Church in Scotland* (Glasgow, 1910), p. 220.

[16] Jos. Robertson, *Concilia Scotiae* (Bannantyne Club, 1866), I, lxxxii; *CPR*, VIII, 344; VII, 18; Hannay, *op. cit.*, pp. 194-195.

called. He was then sent to Basle with an official delegation, soon to be followed by other Scots.[17]

For a short time after the arrival of the Scots at Basle there was peace between the council and the pope, for the latter had been forced to admit conciliar authority. As a result William Croyser also appeared at the ecclesiastical gathering. But by this he did not add to his popularity in Scotland. In June 1434 he made a violent attack upon the ecclesiastical statutes of James I, declaring that they curtailed the liberties of the Church. For this he was again attacked by the king until Aeneas Sylvius visited Scotland on his behalf.[18] At the same time others in Scotland were coming to the conclusion that the best policy was one of submission to the pope. In 1436 Eugene IV successfully outmanoeuvred the council with the result that he ordered it to move to Ferrara. This victory seems to have convinced even Cameron. Therefore, from all quarters James began to receive advice to make his peace with the pope.

Against such pressure as this the king did not long remain obdurate. As a result of a visit from Cameron, Eugene sent James a letter calling up on him to reinstate Croyser in his benefices and to repeal his anti-papal laws. The king responded most humbly. He requested the pope to send him a legate with authority to straighten out the tangled ecclesiastical situation. Pope Eugene immediately responded by sending the Bishop of Urbino with full powers. But before the legate could accomplish anything, in February, 1437, James was murdered at Perth.[19]

The death of James I virtually brings the first period of anti-papal legislation to a close. Although the Douglases, who possessed

[17] J. H. Baxter, *Copiale Prioratus Sanctiandree* (London, 1930), p. 85; Balfour-Melville, *op. cit.*, p. 203; Reid, *op. cit.*, pp. 17ff; R. K. Hannay, "A Letter to Scotland from the Council of Basel," *Scot. Hist. Rev.*, XX (1923), 50.

[18] *Copiale*, pp. 278ff, 433ff; F. A. Gragg, L. C. Gabel, *The Commentaries of Pius II* (Northampton, Mass., 1937), p. 16. Hannay believes that Aeneas went to Scotland on Cameron's behalf. Although the evidence is by no means clear, it is more probable that it was Croyser who was the object of his solicitation. Hannay, "James I, Bishop Cameron and the Papacy," *Scottish Historical Review*, XV (1918), 195; Balfour-Melville, *op. cit.*, p. 234; Reid, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

[19] *CPR*, VIII, 260, 261, 288, 289; *Copiale*, pp. 369ff; O. Raynaldus, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Cologne, 1692), XVIII, 166-167; *Conc. Scot.*, I, lxxxvii.

so much power during the reign, continued to dominate the scene until 1439, nothing seems to have been done about the anti-papal laws. They were not increased, nor do they seem to have been repealed. In spite of Eugene's urging the legate apparently returned to Rome with his mission unfulfilled. It was not likely that the nobles would destroy the legal weapons which they had forged to curtail papal power in Scotland.

From the foregoing it is easy to see that there was little tendency to follow any foreign pattern in Scottish anti-papal legislation. It arose quite naturally out of the situation within the country itself. The main cause seems to have been the determination of the crown and the barons to control the Church for their own benefit. United in this cause they were prepared to enact and enforce laws which would give them control of the ecclesiastical organization in Scotland.

For the next twenty-five years anti-papal legislation practically disappeared. One reason for this was that until 1455 the country was riven with the strife of factions. Two former Douglas vassals, Livingstone of Callander and Crichton of that ilk attempted to seize control of the government. For part of the time Livingstone allied himself with the Douglases while Crichton gained the support of James Kennedy, Bishop of St. Andrews. But these alliances do not seem to have been very permanent. They were continually changing. Hence the political situation was in such a state of flux that, with perhaps the exception of the Douglases, there was no group willing to try conclusions with the papacy. Even the Douglases, however, eventually decided that it was wiser to submit. They, therefore, forsook the Council of Basle and made their peace with the pope.[20]

The only group which continued to battle papal absolutism was that of the conciliar-minded clergy, led by Thomas Livingstone, Abbot of Dundrennan. They did their utmost to have members of their faction received into the main benefices of the Scottish church. But in this they were unsuccessful. In 1443 the parliament of Scotland swore firm and fast obedience to the pope. No one might

[20] *Copiale*, p. 322.

alter his ecclesiastical allegiance without royal permission.[21] As those in control of the government now found it more profitable to be on good terms with the papacy, they were willing to give Eugene their loyal obedience. In this they were followed shortly afterwards by even the clerical supporters of Basle. Thus by 1450 Scotland was once again united in obedience to the papacy.

Yet submission to the pope did not solve all problems. The Scottish kings had long been used to exercising the *jus spolii* with regard to the dioceses of deceased bishops. This privilege James II under the influence of Bishop Kennedy resigned in 1450. At the same time, however, he insisted upon his right to present incumbents to all vacant benefices within the gift of the late bishop. To this statute the clergy agreed. It was confirmed by a provincial council in 1459 and re-enacted by parliament in 1462. Any clerk obtaining possession of a vacant benefice in the gift of a vacant episcopate without royal presentation, was to lose it and be held ineligible for the future. The crown was determined to bar the papacy and any others from infringing on the rights by which it hoped to maintain control of the Church.[22]

In spite of this one law, Scottish relations with the papacy during the reign of James II were generally harmonious. The destruction of the earldom of Douglas in 1455 gave Bishop Kennedy an opportunity to dominate the government. Under his leadership, which lasted until his death in 1465, Scotland lost much of its anti-papal bias. At the same time the pope seems to have become less mistrustful of Scottish ecclesiastical policy. Thus the ten years of Kennedy's supremacy were a period of peace between the Scottish crown and barons, and the papacy.[23] But with the bishop's death the old anti-papal feeling revived and continued until the end of the century. As in the days of James I, the opposition to papal interference in the Church was largely political in its origins. Kennedy's death enabled the political forces which tended to anti-papalism to revive their opposition to the papacy.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 311, 312, 315, 320, 322, 483; *APS*, II, 33, *c.* 2.

[22] R. K. Hannay, ed., *Acts of the Lords of the Council in Public Affairs 1501-1554* (Edinburgh, 1932), pp. xlvi-xlvii.

[23] Hannay, *op. cit.*, p. xlviii.

The party which gained control of the young King James on Kennedy's death was composed of a group of nobles led by the Boyds of Kilmarnock. Supporting them in their endeavor was the late Bishop of St. Andrews' brother, Gilbert Kennedy. With a number of others they planned to seize control of the king, and through him to govern the country. To aid them in this plan, it seems that they were responsible for having Patrick Graham, Bishop of Brechin and nephew of James and Gilbert Kennedy, translated to the see of St. Andrews. As this was the most important bishopric in Scotland, his occupancy of it would be of great aid to them. While this was a good plan at first it soon broke down. A division came between the Boyds and Gilbert Kennedy, with the result that the latter was forced to retire from the government.[24]

The fall of Gilbert Kennedy placed Patrick Graham in an awkward position, as he and Kennedy were not only related by blood but had also entered into a bond of mutual aid and friendship.[25] Moreover, Graham by his activities at Rome provided the Boyds, now his enemies, with a good pretext for attacking him. As early as 1455 he had started on the path of pluralism which during the next ten years added materially to his collection of benefices. His translation to St. Andrews, however, gave him his greatest opportunity. He attempted to gobble up as many benefices, priories, and abbacies as he could obtain. He became the commendator of both the priory of Pittenweem and the abbey of Paisley. The latter was granted to him because the former abbot had refused to pay to Pope Paul II, when cardinal, a pension which had been bestowed upon him by papal authority. Along with these, numerous benefices were added to the episcopal *mensa*, while every

[24] Jas. B. Paul, Ed., *The Scots Peerage* (Edinburgh, 1905), II, 453-4; Jno. Dowden, *The Bishops of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1912), p. 186; J. Herkless and R. K. Hannay, *The Archbishops of St. Andrews* (Edinburgh, 1907), I, 25.

[25] F. J. Grant, *Charter Chest of the Earldom of Wigton*, (Edinburgh, 1910), p. 7.

possible legal protection was given to help Graham retain his acquisitions.[26]

But all that the pope could do was of little avail in Scotland. The Boyds and their faction were now on the warpath against the Kennedy party. Thus it is not suprising that in October, 1466 parliament passed two laws which struck directly at Graham. The first forbade the holding or obtaining of the commendation of any benefice, either secular or religious. Any such benefice which had been "purchased" before should be immediately demitted "undir the payne of tinsale of his temporalite for his tyme and his commende. An undir the pain of Rebellioune uther wais than is lauchful to the ordinare to commende for sex monethis." The second law repeated that of James I against the holding of a pension out of any benefice without the incumbent's consent.[27]

From their very nature it would seem probable that these statutes were aimed at Graham who had but just returned to Scotland with two commendations in his possession. Moreover, the commendation of Paisley had been granted because the former abbot refused to pay a pension. According to the law dealing with pensions the former abbot's removal would thus be *ultra vires*, and Graham's appointment, therefore, doubly illegal.[28] Thus political exigencies were again demanding that papal power and interference in the Scottish church be curtailed. Parliament, completely under Boyd domination, was ready to take any action to ensure the Church's freedom for Scottish exploitation.

The Boyds, however, did not last long in power. Within two years, opposition, in which Graham appears to have been involved, succeeded in bringing about their overthrow.[29] Yet even this did

[26] Jno. Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1851), I, 115; Herkless, *op. cit.*, I, 27ff; *CPR*, XI, 10, XII, 189, 518, 530, 239; A. I. Cameron, *The Apostolic Camera and Scottish Benefices* (London, 1934), pp. 57, 153.

[27] *APS*, II, 85, *cc.* 4, 5.

[28] Herkless, *op. cit.*, I, 32-33.

[29] *Excheq. Rolls*, VIII, xl-xliii; *APS*, II, 186. That Graham was connected with the anti-Boyd party is indicated by a safe-conduct granted to him and a number of the nobles later to be the Boyds' judges. J. Bain, ed., *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland in the Public Record Office* (Edinburgh, 1888), IV, no. 1382.

not necessarily mean a change in the Scottish attitude toward the papacy. Graham had obtained the privilege of confirming all abbots elected in his own diocese without recourse to Rome. This was confirmed by parliament in 1469. All clergy were forbidden to purchase any abbacy or priory falling vacant and no question concerning the holding of these prelacies was to be carried to Rome. But not content even with this, parliament then showed its true colors. No one was to "purchase" outside the realm any benefice which was formerly given or confirmed within Scotland by patrons or bishops; nor was anyone to take action against those who had obtained their benefices in this manner.[30]

Like so many of the others, the purpose of this law was to keep the filling of Scottish ecclesiastical benefices in the hands of Scotsmen. That Graham would favor the first part of it is certain. But when we remember his earlier activities at Rome, it is doubtful that he would approve so heartily of its second section. Indeed, the latter part of the statute may be an indication of the revival of antagonism towards him. The laity and clergy alike would desire to curtail his attempts to obtain preferment directly from the pope. Therefore, they may have taken this method of thwarting his designs, by preventing the pope from acceding to his requests.

While we cannot state explicitly that this law was a direct product of anti-Graham sentiment, it is significant that shortly after its enactment opposition to him came to a head. Graham as Bishop of Brechin had been none too popular because of his dictatorial treatment of the clergy under his authority.[31] As Bishop of St. Andrews he followed the same policy. When abbots would not pay him amounts of money which he demanded, he would quarter himself upon them with a large train. If they then resisted, he would decree their deposition. Other clergy were treated in the same way, with the result that many sought exemption from his episcopal authority.[32] Along with this he sometimes refused to

[30] *APS*, II, 98.

[31] Herkless, *op. cit.*, I, 43ff.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 34, 35, 85; C. Innes, ed., *Liber S. Thome de Aberbrothoc* (Bannantyne Club, 1856), II, 164; *CPR*, XII, 709, 725, 390, 345; *Apost. Cam.*, p. 162.

confirm the presentees of lay and ecclesiastical patrons of benefices.[33] Consequently his unpopularity in Scotland was on the increase. But even more disastrous than his treatment of his subordinates was his failure to pay sums which he owed to the papal see.[34] This was the last straw. Graham therefore decided to go to Rome to obtain both protection from the Scots and forgiveness from the pope.

If Graham thought that seeking protection at Rome would help him he was sorely mistaken. On May 6, 1471, parliament enacted another law dealing with those who attempted to obtain benefices in Rome. It repeated the law of 1469 with additions. Any benefice which had never been filled by the pope before was not to be "purchased" in Rome; nor was taxation on the Church to be increased; nor were any unions of benefices to abbacies or bishoprics, made since the accession of James III, to be held valid. The reason annexed was "the innowmerable riches that Is had out of the realme thar throw."[35] Yet from the provisions of the statute it seems that the main interest was not so much economic, as it was an attempt to restrain Graham. Parliament was hoping to stifle any attempts on his part to increase his ecclesiastical holdings. Anti-papalism was thus necessary if the unpopular bishop was to be restrained.

This law was actually a complete failure. Within a short time of his arrival in Rome, Graham had succeeded, probably beyond even his own wildest dreams. He obtained the possession of numerous benefices, gained for himself the commendatorship of Scotland's wealthiest abbey, Arbroath; and to climax it all he succeeded in having St. Andrews erected into an archdiocese with the other Scottish bishops placed under his tender care.[36] In spite of his treatment of his subordinates, and perhaps because of his opposition

[33] *CPR*, XII, 609.

[34] Herkless, *op. cit.*, I, 40.

[35] *APS*, II, 99, *c.* 4.

[36] Herkless, *op. cit.*, pp. 47, 50, 51, 76; A. Theiner, ed., *Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum* (Rome, 1864), Nos. 852-855; *Apost. Cam.*, pp. 67, 68, 173, 175, 188, 190.

to the Scottish parliament, Graham had succeeded in attaining the highest position yet held in the Scottish church.

The reactions in Scotland to this denouement were what might have been expected. Some of the Scottish bishops seem to have applied for exemption from Graham's authority. Such petitions were probably granted.[37] The laity reacted even more violently. As soon as Graham arrived in Scotland all his lands were taken over by the king who also forbade him to use his archiepiscopal authority. A royal embassy was then dispatched to Rome asking for action against Graham who had broken the Scottish statutes. After considerable trouble both with the papacy and Graham, James and his councillors obtained the archbishop's deposition. So violent was the protest of Scottish clergy and laity alike, the pope could hardly refuse to have Graham tried, with the result that he was removed from office.[38] Where legislation had failed the Scots found that loud complaint would succeed. The lesson was not lost, for if the pope would not heed their laws, the Scots were beginning to realize that of necessity he would be forced to acquiesce when they took direct action.

The victory which he had gained over Graham, emboldened the king and his councillors to further effort of the same kind. From this time on there was a definite increase in the attempts of the crown to dominate appointments to high ecclesiastical offices. They were suitable rewards for the king's favorites and supporters. Therefore, more and more James assumed the right to make presentations to the major Scottish prelacies. We have a good example of this procedure in the provision of William Scheves, a friend of the king, to the archbishopric of St. Andrews in 1478. One of James III's low-born favorites, Scheves, had aided his master against Graham. Consequently the king considered that he would make

[37] The only real example of this which we have, although there may have been others, is the exemption of the Bishop of Aberdeen. Theiner, *op. cit.*, No. 858.

[38] *Ibid.*, No. 863; *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society* (Edinburgh, 1919), III, 176ff; Herkless, *op. cit.*, II, 57-78; T. Dickson, Ed., *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1877), I, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49; C. J. Lyon, *History of St. Andrews* (Edinburgh, 1843), I, 234.

a suitable archbishop, and the pope was obliged to agree. Another provision of the same type was later made to Robert Blackader, an arrant pluralist, who apparently with royal support obtained first the bishopric of Aberdeen, and shortly afterwards that of Glasgow. The crown was gradually gaining possession of the key positions in the Church. The pope was usually asked to give his approval to James' nominees, but that was about all the influence he possessed.[39]

To the provision of Scheves to St. Andrews not only the king, but also parliament gave hearty concurrence. It confirmed all "gifts, donations, grants, privileges, liberties and freedoms" bestowed upon the archdiocese of St. Andrews, as well as all annexations and unions of benefices made thereto. In 1482 parliament also gave official approval to the archbishop's right to confirm abbots and priors within his diocese, without recourse to Rome.[40] Since the nobles now approved of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, they were in favor of all privileges which might be bestowed upon him by the pope. These privileges were all in the direction of increasing the archbishop's power at the expense of the pope. If the archbishop opposed the barons, however, they would then be against his receiving greater powers. Under such conditions, papal grants to St. Andrews would be regarded with hostility.

Before long exactly such a situation began to develop, due to a conflict between the crown and some of the nobles. Although James and his barons had seen eye to eye on the matter of Graham, they were actually opposed to each other on political grounds. The reason was that James had surrounded himself with a number of low-born favorites who were his constant companions, while the nobles had merely a formal part in the government. At the head of the opposition to his choice of councillors were James' two

[39] Jas. Balfour, *Historical Works* (Edinburgh, 1824), I, 198; Spottiswoode, *op. cit.*, p. 119; Jas. Campbell, *Balmerino and its Abbey* (Edinburgh, 1899), p. 225; Jas. Morton, *The Monastic Annals of Teviotdale* (Edinburgh, 1832), p. 20; John Leslie, *The Historie of Scotland*, E. G. Cody and Wm. Murison, edd. (Edinburgh, 1895), II, 90; *Apost. Cam.*, p. 73; Jno. Dowden, *The Bishops of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1912), pp. 34, 331; Herkless, *op. cit.*, pp. 85, 87; Theiner, Nos. 865, 867.

[40] *APS*, II, 129, 140.

brothers, the Duke of Albany and the Earl of Mar. Although they tried to force him to accept them and their friends in place of his favorites, they were unsuccessful; and the two princes were arrested. Mar died under somewhat suspicious circumstances in prison, while shortly afterwards Albany fled to France for safety.[41] This, however, did not end the matter. The discontented nobles under the leadership of the Earls of Angus and Argyle at home, and Albany still abroad, kept up their struggle. By his policies James lost the support of his barons so that even when later Albany for a short time became head of the government the king obtained little help from them. This is the political background to the ecclesiastical history of the time.

In his conflict with the nobility James had the help of his two ecclesiastical favorites, Scheves and Blackader. The latter spent much of his time in Rome as James' special envoy. There he no doubt worked to have the pope provide the king's nominees to any benefices or prelacies which fell vacant. In this way he would obtain help and support for James by placing the Church's wealth and power in the king's hands.[42]

Meanwhile parliament had been taking action to curtail the granting of benefices in Rome. It was decreed that no one was to go or send to Rome for benefices; nor was anyone to be permitted to hold a pension out of any ecclesiastical benefice. Scottish benefices were to be provided at home by the duly constituted patrons. Attempts to obtain ecclesiastical preferment by any other means were specifically condemned.[42]

The statute concerning the filling of ecclesiastical vacancies soon brought to light the differences between the crown and the barons. Some two or three months after the enacting of the law regarding pensions the pope made provision to the empty see of Glasgow. About the same time the cathedral chapter elected a bishop. The provided prelate was Robert Blackader, the king's ally; while the

[41] Wm. Fraser, *The Douglas Book* (Edinburgh, 1885), II, 69ff; Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie, *Chronicles of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1814), I, 181; *Exchequer Rolls*, VIII, lxii.

[42] Primrose, *op. cit.*, p. 129; Theiner, *op. cit.*, Nos. 873, 876; Dowden, *op. cit.*, p. 330.

[43] *APS*, II, 141, *c.* 17, 144, *c.* 9.

elected prelate was George Carmichell, a friend of Angus and Albany. Direct conflict was the result. The barons supported their man, while the king and the pope insisted that Blackader should become bishop of Glasgow. To enforce his wishes the pope issued a very strongly worded decree ordering the supporters of Carmichell to desist from their opposition under pain of major excommunication. This ultimatum gave Blackader the victory, but it also showed the barons that the papacy would usually support the king against them. James, on the other hand, could be certain of gaining power by means of papal provisions of his friends to high ecclesiastical offices.[44]

Perhaps for this reason further anti-papal laws were enacted in the following year. One of the statutes repeated the earlier prohibition against seeking in Rome provision to benefices in a vacant bishopric. According to the laws of James II the king held the patronage to all these livings, and parliament was determined that his rights should not be lightly disregarded. The chancellor was specifically instructed to inform the pope of parliament's wishes in this matter. While it would look as though James were attempting to assert his independence of the papacy with regard to these provisions, it is not very likely. He was too much in need of papal help. Instead it may be that the baronial opposition hoped to sow discord between king and pope by this means. The specific instructions to the chancellor would seem to point in that direction. Moreover, the renewal of James I's anti-barratry laws seems to strengthen this view. It is not probable that James would make such a gratuitous attempt to alienate papal sympathy. It would seem rather that the barons were ready to take any measures to protect themselves from papal interference.[45]

Even if James were responsible for the attempts to increase his power over the Church at the expense of Rome, he was not long able to maintain such an attitude. Trouble was again brewing on the domestic front. The nobles were becoming restive under the

[44] Theiner, *op. cit.*, No. 873; Dowden, *op. cit.*, p. 330; Herkless, *op. cit.*, I, 110; *Apost. Cam.*, p. 79.

[45] *APS*, II, 166, *cc.* 9, 11.

rule of James' favorites. Moreover, Archbishop Scheves had become entangled with the curia over the misappropriation of papal funds. James, therefore, determined to send Scheves to Rome, both to clear his own name and perhaps to obtain aid for his royal master against the barons. He was also to request on the king's behalf, the privilege of presenting to the pope a suitable man to fill any bishopric which had not been vacant for more than six months. In this way James hoped to obtain the legal right to place his own supporters in the various Scottish bishoprics as they fell vacant.[46]

Scheves never actually went to Rome. Instead the pope, Innocent VIII, appointed James, Bishop of Imola to go to Scotland as peacemaker. He was to dissolve all conspiracies, and any clergy who refused to obey him were to be deposed, while the laity who continued recalcitrant were to be put under interdict. If repentance was not shown within a month their cases were to be reserved for the judgment of the pope. At the same time Innocent wrote James telling him that he was having difficulties with various suitors at Rome. There were often two or three claimants for one benefice each of whom said that he was a royal nominee. The nobles were using trickery in an attempt to obtain papal provisions for their supporters. Innocent also warned the barons not to rebel against their liege lord. He categorically dissolved all bonds and nullified all oaths against the king. Imola was given full power to see that the papal commands were carried out. By this means, it was hoped, the nobles would be forced to submit to the king.[47]

To strengthen the hands of James' party, the pope in the following year granted Scheves the position of primate of all Scotland and *legatus natus*. Only Glasgow, Blackader's diocese, was exempted from his authority. This was a sop to the ambition of the Bishop of Glasgow. The elevation of Scheves, however, completed the process of bringing the Scottish church under the king's power. He could now be sure that the authority of the titular head of the Scottish ecclesiastical organization would be employed for his bene-

[46] A. Gottlob, *Aus der Camera Apostolica* (Innsbruck, 1889), p. 212; Herkless, *op. cit.*, I, 113ff; *APS*, II, 171.

[47] Theiner, *op. cit.*, No. 881; Raynaldus, *op. cit.*, XIX, 359ff.

fit. When we consider the wide lands and great wealth which were now finally placed under Scheves' control, the augmentation of James' power must have been very welcome.[48]

To this demonstration of his favor, Innocent then added two others of equal moment. Blackader and Scheves persuaded him to grant James the right to present nominees to the pope for provision to all churches and monasteries of a stated value within eight months of their falling vacant. This was an extension of what James had originally instructed Scheves to request. Along with this, Innocent also granted permission for any members of the royal family to have mass celebrated in regions placed under the interdict. Such a privilege would enable the pope to discipline the rebellious barons without affecting the king or his supporters. The pope was ready to give all possible aid to the king in case of trouble.[49]

Against these measures little concerted effort was made by the nobility whether inside or outside of parliament. The opposition seem to have been cowed into silence. Therefore, the nobles did not object too strenuously. In January, 1488, however, they did insist that the royal privileges with regard to patronage and also the electoral rights of the monks of certain monasteries should not be violated by the pope. They also warned James against permitting papal legates to enter the country without first making sure that they would not injure the common weal.[50] Most of the opposition elements do not seem to have been present at parliament when these laws were enacted, but even James' supporters were none too friendly to papal pretensions.

This parliament, however, is of more importance than these laws would indicate. It was this body that caused the explosion which put James off the throne and finally broke papal power in Scotland. Yet it was not a matter of principle which caused the trouble. It was merely a struggle between James and the Homes' for the possession of the priory of Coldingham. For years the

[48] *Apost. Cam.*, p. 219.

[49] *Apost. Cam.*, p. 219; Herkless, *op. cit.*, I, 126; Raynaldus, *op. cit.*, XIX, 387.

[50] *APS*, II, 183, *cc.* 12, 16.

Homes had acted as the priory's baillies, governing its lands and even at times furnishing it with priors. But as the house had declined rapidly in recent years, James desired to have it united to his Chapel Royal at Stirling. To this he gained parliament's consent in 1485 and again in 1487. No one was to take any steps against the union under pain of "life, lands and goods." But still the Homes refused to surrender their control of the priory's wealth. Thus in January, 1488 commissioners were appointed to deal with any who would obstruct the union. This was the match which exploded the gunpowder.[51]

Three days after the commissioners were appointed, the Homes and the Hepburns seized the crown prince and rebelled against James III. They were immediately joined by all those opposed to James and also by some of his erstwhile friends, the most prominent being Robert Blackader, Bishop of Glasgow. This prelate seems to have felt that by supporting the rebels he would be able most easily to advance his own ecclesiastical fortunes. Although the forces of the barons did not gain an immediate victory, their ultimate success was sure. England, France, and the papacy were powerless to help James, even if they were willing. Finally on June 11 the two armies met at Sauchie not far from Bannockburn. There battle was joined, and by evening James' forces were routed. He himself was murdered while attempting to escape from the field.[52]

With the death of James III the anti-papal party gained control. Representing James' old antagonists, they could not but remember the aid which the pope had afforded their late liege lord. Thus it was not to be expected that they would show any strong love for the pope. They felt, rather, that he had been one of the principal obstacles to their plans. He had supported James and his low-born associates against the king's proper councillors, the Scottish nobil-

[51] J. Raine, ed., *Correspondence etc. of the Priory of Coldingham* (London, 1841), shows the position of the Homes, and James' negotiations to get control of the priory and its lands. (cf. pp. 200-235) Chas. Rogers, *History of the Chapel of Royal Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1882), xxiii ff; *APS*, II, 179, 183, 184.

[52] *Douglas Bk.*, II, 81ff; Raynaldus, *op. cit.*, XIX, 388.

ity. Now that the latter had gained the ascendency they would be indifferent, if not actually opposed, to papal interests.

The first indication of the new government's attitude was given by the parliament held in January, 1489. At that time a law was enacted creating Glasgow an archdiocese. Blackader was to be given equality with Scheves of St. Andrews, who had remained loyal to James III. The king, James IV, then wrote the pope demanding that Blackader be granted the pallium. Scheves, however, was at Rome and he opposed Blackader's desire for promotion. Although Glasgow obtained archiepiscopal rank within a short time, Blackader did not obtain the pallium.[53] That was not enough. Scheves was still primate of Scotland and *legatus natus*, and had recently been made conservator of the privileges of the cathedral chapter of Glasgow. Blackader, therefore, could not be content with a mere parliamentary archbishopric. Consequently he took action at Rome to have the primacy of St. Andrews abolished. But the lawsuit was soon interrupted by an order from home. Parliament instructed the two archbishops to drop the case and return to Scotland, where the king would adjudicate on their claims. If either of them should then refuse to submit and cease litigation, he would be permitted neither to collect taxes nor to take any money out of the realm. Thus the civil power peremptorily removed the case from the papal court in order that it might itself deal with the matter. Scottish national interests rather than papal law or wishes were to be the governing force in church affairs.[54]

At the same time, parliament turned its attention to the old question of the "purchasing" of elective benefices at Rome. In 1493 it re-enacted the two old laws to protect royal rights over benefices in vacant bishoprics and to prevent clerks from carrying money to Rome. Three years later the second law was repeated,

[53] Glasgow's privileges and powers were to be fixed by "the said bishop of Glasgow and the prelates and baronis." No mention is made of papal authority. *APS*, II, 213; Herkless, *op. cit.*, I, 140; *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian* (London, 1864), I, 200, 202.

[54] *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish* (London, 1862), II, 69; *APS*, II, 232; Theiner, *op. cit.*, p. 502. The last reference shows that parliament's action was in direct contravention of papal instructions.

apparently because of faulty enforcement. This was the end of anti-papal legislation in fifteenth-century Scotland.[55]

The first sixty years of the sixteenth century saw few additions to the anti-papal statutes. The reason was that the pope had largely given up making provisions to Scottish benefices without lay nomination. One exception, which, however, proves the rule, made its appearance after the battle of Flodden Field. The pope attempted to provide his own nephew to St. Andrews, and at the same time granted most of the benefices of those slain in the battle to Andrew Forman, Bishop of Moray. Forman was forced, however, to disgorge most of his acquisitions; and the primacy was given to him instead of the pope's nephew, as a result of a compromise between political factions.[56]

From this time to the Reformation there was little trouble between Scotland and the papacy. Leo X acknowledged the crown's right to nominate to bishoprics, while both he and his successors permitted the large landowners to appoint their friends to the various benefices, collegiate churches and monasteries under their control. True, in 1525 parliament ordered the proper enforcement of the act forbidding the "purchase" of Scottish benefices at Rome. But two years later this was modified somewhat by another act which stated that the king had the right to nominate all bishops while the pope merely confirmed them.[57] Thus by 1560 anti-papal legislation had died a natural death; not because the Scots had lost interest in the matter, but because they had won the battle. Therefore, anti-papalism of the fifteenth-century brand had no longer any *raison d'être*. Sixteenth-century anti-papalism was of a different type. It was doctrinal and in 1560 brought about the complete break from Rome.

Thus in glancing back over fifteenth-century anti-papal legislation we find that it had certain very specific causes. Something of a nationalistic feeling may have been at its source. But far more

[55] *APS*, II, 232, *c.* 3, 237, *c.* 2.

[56] Herkless, *op. cit.*, II, 113.

[57] *APS*, II, 294, *c.* 2, 309, *c.* 1, 378, *c.* 46; W. C. Mathieson, *Politics and Religion* (Edinburgh, 1902), I, 28.

important as an immediate cause was the desire of the crown and the baronage to control appointments to ecclesiastical benefices and offices. There was the urge to obtain control of church lands as sources of both economic and political power. Similar as were these motives operating in England a century earlier, they seem to have been entirely Scottish in their origin. While the Scots appear to have imitated their southern cousins in their anti-papal statutes, it would seem that baronial and royal greed coupled with the exigencies of domestic politics were the sole causes of fifteenth-century Scottish anti-papal legislation.

W. STANFORD REID

McGill University

AMERICAN TRAVELLERS IN ROME, 1848-1850

SEVERAL years ago, in connection with researches in Italy on Italo-American relations, the author had the opportunity to examine the files of three daily newspapers of Rome—the *Gazzetta di Roma* from March 2, 1848, to January 29, 1849, the *Monitore Romano: giornale ufficiale* from January 30, 1849, to July 4, 1849, and the *Giornale di Roma* from July 6, 1849, to December 31, 1850. During this three-year period, these papers, among other items, published the name, position, nationality, city of origin, and destination of all persons arriving in and departing from Rome.[1] The fact that the period coincided with the turbulent events which witnessed the rise in popularity of Pius IX, his flight to Gaeta, the reign of the Roman Triumvirate of the Republic, the occupation of Rome by the French troops, and finally the return of His Holiness to Rome as the sovereign ruler of the Papal States, encouraged the writer to extract from these lists the information concerning the American visitors.

Several interesting facts have come to light as a result of this study. It was a revelation to find that approximately nine hundred Americans representing many trades and professions and all walks of life visited Rome during this period. The exact number cannot be determined, for the newspapers listed only the names of those arriving and departing; they did not include the names of persons who did not move in or out of Rome during the period. Besides, in some cases, if an American arrived with his family, only the name of the head of the household was given, with no indication as to the number of persons that composed the family.

Of the total 882 American visitors listed, the majority, that is, 554, or about 61 percent, were described as wealthy ("possidenti")

[1] Since the papal government required that all passports of foreigners should be examined and approved by the ministers or consuls of their respective countries, the official lists of American visitors were sent from time to time to the Department of State by the United States consuls. These will be printed in Leo Francis Stock's forthcoming volume, United States Consuls to the Papal States.

or landowners ("proprietari"). However, these descriptions are not very significant, since very often both the terms *possidenti* and *proprietari* were applied to men who were later identified as clergymen, missionaries, educators, authors, teachers of religion and art, Catholic bishops, wood engravers, artists, critics, literateurs, etc. No information as to occupation or economic position was given in the case of 207 (or 23 percent) other American visitors to Rome. The other 121 Americans, comprising the remaining 16 percent, were described as follows: [1a] naval officers (29), ecclesiastics (15), army officers (10), consular officers (9), businessmen (9), diplomatic officers (8), members of nobility (8), students (5), physicians (4), artists (4), clerks (3), despatch officers (3), secretaries (2), travellers (2), public officers (2), machinist (1), actor (1), architect (1), engraver (1), chemist (1), sculptor (1), messenger (1), and teacher (1).

Naturally, the vast majority of the travellers had Anglo-Saxon-sounding names; only a few were found with Italian or other foreign-sounding names. These included such persons as M. D'Attelis, P. Defeure, F. Azziaga, W. Janvier, Jacob Melek, G. Garibaldi and others—men who had become naturalized citizens of the United States.[2]

The information given concerning each traveller was not always consistent or complete. For example, in some cases the same person appears to have left Rome on two or more occasions during the period, yet there was no information as to when he had returned to the city during the interval. In several other instances the first name of the traveller was not given. This has made it impossible to establish the identity of the person. There were also several

[1a] The figures in parentheses represent the total number under each classification.

[2] In the case of Garibaldi, we know that he was not an American citizen, since at this time he had not even been in America. However, when the French entered Rome, he was aided in his escape by Mr. Cass, the American chargé. Cf. H. R. Marraro, "Unpublished American Documents on the Roman Republic of 1849," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXVIII (1943), 483. Though Garibaldi later came to the United States, and though he applied for his citizenship papers, we know that he never received his final papers. However, on many occasions Garibaldi claimed American citizenship.

cases of well-known names that were misspelled, as, for example, March for Marsh, Caff for Cass, etc., etc.

Of the 882 persons, 78 are included in the *Dictionary of American Biography*—a fact which gives some indication of the important positions these men occupied in their respective fields. In his *Come gli Americani scoprirono l'Italia, 1750-1850*,[3] Professor Giuseppe Prezzolini lists twenty-three of these persons, but only three who are not included in the *Dictionary of American Biography*.

The diaries, memoirs, autobiographies, and other writings of these American visitors reveal much interesting information concerning the political and social conditions they found in the Papal States, the reaction of Americans in Rome to the contemporary events, and more particularly concerning the part they played during this critical period of the relations between the United States and the papal and revolutionary governments involving, among other things, the question of recognition of the Republicans by Lewis Cass Jr., the newly appointed American minister.

Sister Loretta Clare Feiertag[4] and the author of this article[5] have already discussed the reaction of Americans to the political events in the Papal States during this period. But the evidence, as presented in these works, is incomplete, largely owing to the fact that since no information has been available on the number and identity of the Americans who were in Rome, it has not been possible to discover records of their impressions of the political conditions in the Papal States during these years. It is the purpose of this article to record only the new information that has come to light as a result of further researches on the subject, in the hope that we may gain a more complete picture of the part played by Americans during this interesting period of papal-American relations.

[3] Giuseppe Prezzolini, *Come gli Americani scoprirono l'Italia 1750-1850*, (Milan, 1933).

[4] Sister Loretta Clare Feiertag, *American Public Opinion on the Diplomatic Relations between the United States and the Papal States, 1847-67*, (Washington, D. C., 1933).

[5] H. R. Marraro, *American Public Opinion on the Unification of Italy, 1848-61*, (New York, 1932).

In order that the reader may have a fuller appreciation of the improved conditions Americans found in Rome during the early years of the pontificate of Pius IX, it may be well to record briefly the observations made by an American who visited the city toward the end of the reign of Gregory XVI. He was William Mitchell Gillespie, a civil engineer, who visited Rome while pursuing advanced studies at the Ecole des Ponts et Chausées in Paris. In 1845, on his return to the United States, Gillespie published a book [6] which is crammed with information on what to see, hear, eat, and drink in Rome. In a chapter devoted to the modern Romans, Gillespie aimed to correct the fashion for travellers to stigmatize the inhabitants of Italy, and particularly those of Rome, as spiritless and cowardly, superstitious and ignorant, effeminate and cruel. Gillespie insisted that the Romans of his day were not unworthy of their illustrious ancestors, emphasizing the frequent, though abortive, struggles the people had made for liberty. At the moment of his visit, he stated, the government was busily imprisoning and shooting the leaders of a new conspiracy. Government spies, according to Gillespie, were in every house, and gave information of the first whisper of disaffection. As they were aware of this, the people dared not openly utter their sentiments. When the bad state of the road along which he was walking in the company of a Roman, led Gillespie to speak of the indolence of the government, the Roman stopped short—looked around him, " as if he feared that the ditches had ears "—and then, in a low whisper, though no one else was even in sight, he replied: " You are a foreigner, and you may say what you please; but, for us Romans, our mouths "—and here he emphatically covered his with his hand—" our mouths are given us to eat and to drink with, but not to talk of the government." Nevertheless, Gillespie found that the Italian Republicans were undis-

[6] William Mitchell Gillespie, *Rome: as Seen by a New Yorker in 1843-44*, (New York, 1845). The book was reviewed in *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, XVI, (1845), 192; and in *The American Review*, (March, 1845), 326. Cf. *Dictionary of American Biography*, VII, 288-9. A. Van Raymond, *Union University*, I, (1907), 216-20, with portrait. Gillespie's observations are not generally known. Neither Feiertag nor this author refers to him in their respective works. Gillespie visited Rome again in 1848, departing from the city on March 13, 1848, for Naples.

mayed and active in the cause of freedom; and he had heard a Roman gentleman denounce the government, and plead for liberty with enthusiastic vehemence.

Gillespie found that the faults of the Romans were mostly due to the government; their good qualities, to themselves. The government was so busy in regulating the affairs of the Church, that it could not find time to attend to the temporal welfare of its subjects. The cardinals, who administered it, were a century behind the rest of the world in political enlightenment. Though the whole city was supported by the tourist trade, these cardinals discouraged foreign intercourse, lest the faith of the citizens be shaken. They had even rejected the proposal to construct a railroad between Rome and Civita Vecchia, its Mediterranean port. The only business of Rome was the manufacture of cameos, mosaics, and picture-copies, the streets being lined with shops for their sale to foreigners.

Gillespie gained the impression that the Roman Government was, in effect, only one great missionary society for propagating the Roman Catholic faith over the whole world, and that everything else was considered subordinate to this grand object. Every other form of knowledge was not only neglected, but positively discouraged. A man who distinguished himself in liberal investigations, according to Gillespie, was marked as a dangerous citizen and an object of the jealous and distrustful surveillance of the police, for the government felt that ignorance was their strength. Instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and in religion, was indeed bestowed on the people with great copiousness, since in Rome, with a population of 150,000, there were 380 primary schools, which employed 480 teachers, and received 14,000 scholars. But these schools, according to Gillespie, were under the direction of the priesthood, who made use of them as powerful engines for instilling into the minds of the rising generation their own prejudices, and the doctrines best adapted to discourage investigation, and to impress the duty of unreasoning submission to the ruling authority. The Romans were taught that their own country and government were the best in the world. Furthermore, Gillespie found that the people had a very confused notion of America. On one occasion he was asked by a Roman lady how many wives men were allowed

to have. When he answered "four", she inquired (interpreting him seriously) if Americans were Turks in their religion too! A young Roman, intending to emigrate to America, went to Ancona to embark. But there he heard that there were slaves in America, and so changed his mind. "I was afraid," said he, "that when I got there they would make me a slave, and never let me see my friends again, and so I turned about and came home!"[7]

Students of Italian history know that the backward political and social conditions described by Gillespie were considerably improved almost immediately after the election of Pius IX in June, 1846 as the sovereign ruler of the Papal States. Almost without exception Americans who were in Rome at the time paid glowing tributes of praise to the liberal policies of the new pope. They saw in him the leader who was sincerely endeavoring to better the condition of his subjects. Americans hoped that under the new pope the separate states of Italy might be united and her political wrongs redressed. The letters and diaries of Americans who were in Rome at this time gave a very favorable picture of the political scene.

Christopher Pearse Cranch,[8] painter, critic, poet, accompanied by his family and George William Curtis, arrived in Rome toward the end of October, 1846, just when Pius IX was becoming the idol of the liberals, and was stirring all the world with hope by professions and by proofs of confidence in the people. They intended to make only a short visit, since they had planned to return to Florence. But, besides the wonderful attractions for them, "in which Rome stood alone," he found that this was the place of all others in Italy for the life of an artist. He experienced there a perpetual stimulus to draw and paint.[9]

Cranch saw Pius IX, "who is so much beloved, and with good reason," for he had liberated all political offenders, and had commenced his reign with "benevolence and justice." In his diary

[7] Gillespie, *op. cit.*, pp. 192-196.

[8] Christopher Pearse Cranch, *Personal Recollections of Robert Browning*, (1891); Leonora Cranch Scott, *The Life and Letters of Christopher Pearse Cranch* (by his daughter), (Boston, 1917); *Dictionary of American Biography*, IV, 501-502. Cranch departed from Rome, April 13, 1848, for Naples.

[9] Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-105.

Cranch described the procession, led by the Pope through several streets to the oldest church in Rome, St. John Lateran, where he received the keys of the church. The city was full of people who had come to be present at this festival, and Cranch hoped to see a grand show.[10]

Elsewhere Cranch described the "glorious *Moccoletti*" on the day of the receipt of the news of the Viennese Revolution. The whole city was like a carnival for joy. The Corso was crowded. Romans collected in large numbers about the old Venetian Palace, the residence of the Austrian ambassador. Ascending the walls with a ladder, several citizens tore down the Austrian arms with triumphant shouts and threw the escutcheon into the street and danced upon it. It was then dragged by a donkey all the way to the Piazza del Popolo, and publicly burned. People went about with pieces of wood stuck in their hatbands. "I never saw such jubilant joy and enthusiasm," concluded Cranch, "crowds upon crowds singing national hymns, and shouting, and all holding up their lights—others stemming the tide in carriages, and all keeping their lights unquenched—none offering to put out his neighbor's, after the usual custom."[11]

Cranch's observations are corroborated by his travelling companion, George William Curtis,[12] author and orator, whose letters to the *Courier and Enquirer* and to the New York *Daily Tribune*, devoted mostly to public affairs and public men, showed keenness of observation, sound, shrewd judgment of men and things, and a breadth and penetration which were remarkable in so young and entirely inexperienced a writer. As he journeyed toward Rome, the charms of Italy took closer possession of him. "Italy," he wrote after a week in that city, "is no fable, and the wonderful depth of purity in the air and blue in the sky has hung upon my eyes all

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 107-108.

[11] Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

[12] Cf. George William Curtis, *From an Easy Chair*, (New York, 1892-94), 3 vols.; Edward Cary, *George William Curtis*, (Boston and New York, 1894); George Willis Cooke, Ed., *Early Letters of George William Curtis to John S. Dwight: Brook Farm and Concord*, (New York, 1898). Cf. *Dictionary of American Biography*, IV, 614. Curtis arrived in Rome on October 17, 1849, from Turin, and left on November 14, 1849, for Naples.

this glorious day." The music of St. Peter's reminded him of the voices from heaven, since, he wrote, it "warmed and ennobled the soul with a sense of celestial splendor."

Curtis saw the Pope frequently, and always referred to him with sympathy, as in the description of the festival of the Eve of St. John's. He completes his description of the festival in these words:

> The Pope came forward above the ringing shouts and in the steady splendor and bowed his head to the railing of the balcony. Then came a moment of stillness; the crowd was hushed as a sleeping child, and the Pope raised his hands, breathed a short prayer, and turning to the crowd gave his blessing and retired. Then came the shouts again and the music and new rockets and candles—until in a few moments all was still again, but it was a sight rare and impressive. The vast crowd drawn alone by reverence and respect to their chief—and he responding to their call with no appeal to passion or pride, but with a prayer and his blessing. In no other country could that be seen. In no other country could the vast sentiment inspired by a mass of people obeying a noble instinct be so sublimely crowned. It was perfect. It was a scene for the Arcadia of a poet—or the paradise of a wise Christian.[13]

Curtis praised the Pope and his liberal reforms for his subjects in a letter dated Rome, November 2, 1846, to John S. Dwight, in which he wrote:

> One cannot see the present Pope without a hope for Italy. I first saw him at high mass, with the cardinals, in the Palace chapel.... The Pope is a noble-looking man, of dignified and graceful presence, and already very dear to the people for what he has done and what he has promised. I could not look at him without sadness as a man sequestered in splendor and removed from the small sympathies in which lies the mass of human happiness. The service seemed a worship of him, but no homage could recompense a man for what a Pope had lost. I have seen him often since, and his demeanor is always marked by the same air of lofty independence. It is good to see him appear equal to a position so solitary and so commanding, and to indicate this vigor of life and the conscience which would prevent him from making his seclusion a bower for his own ease.[14]

Americans took advantage of every occasion to praise the Pope. In connection with the celebration at the Trattoria Bertini in Rome

[13] Cary, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-47.

[14] Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

of Washington's birthday by the American residents in the city, the fifty persons who were present, led by the United States consul, who presided, offered toasts to Washington, and to the "adored" Pius IX, as if to testify that the "Prince reformer" of Rome enjoyed among the civilized nations of the world the same sympathy as the "American hero" who, at the beginning, was looked down upon with disgust by the enemies of liberty and with doubtful hopes by the warmest lovers of liberty.[15]

Even well-known American liberals, such as Margaret Fuller, went out of their way to praise Pius IX. In two letters to R. W. Emerson, one dated Rome, May, 1847, and the other dated December 20, 1847, she admitted that Pius IX was "a real great heart" and that she liked "to be within its [the love of the people for the pope] influence."[16]

There were, of course, a few skeptics among Americans. George Perkins Marsh, a diplomat, who later became American minister to Italy, in 1847, wrote to a friend:

> Do not, for heaven's sake, commit yourself to the belief in *a liberal Pope*! It is a contradiction in terms—an impossibility in the very nature of things. Whatever Pius IX may think now, he will find that he can't be both Pope and patriot.[17]

An American who played an important role in the political affairs of Rome during this period was James Alexander Hamilton, lawyer and politician, who went so far as to contribute plans of constitutional and financial reforms to his Italian friends. Because his activities in Rome are generally unknown or forgotten, it may be well to examine them here in some detail as the author himself described them in his autobiography.[18]

[15] *Il Contemporaneo*, Rome, February 27, 1847.

[16] Margaret Fuller Ossoli, *Memoirs*, (London, 1852), III, 131, 154-155. Cf. also M. F. Ossoli, *At Home and Abroad or Things and Thoughts in America and Europe*, (Boston, 1856). For details concerning the role she played in the revolutionary disturbances in Rome see the works of Feiertag and Marraro.

[17] C. C. Marsh, *Life and Letters of George Perkins Marsh*, (New York, 1888), I, 116.

[18] James A. Hamilton, *Reminiscences of James A. Hamilton, or Men and Events, at Home and Abroad, during Three Quarters of a Century*, (New York, 1869). Cf. *Dictionary of American Biography*, VIII, 188-189. Hamilton departed from Rome, November 1, 1849, for Naples.

On October 11, 1847, five days before he sailed on his third voyage to Europe, Hamilton addressed a letter to James K. Polk, in which he informed the President of the United States of his intention to spend the winter in Italy, and of the attention he had given to the course of events in the peninsula. Then Hamilton continued:

> Under the government of Pius IX the people of the Roman States are endeavoring to break their chains, and their example has inspired those of the other Italian states to make an effort to throw off the iron despotism of their princes, which is sustained by the power of Austria.
>
> In this state of things it has occurred to me that the expression of the sympathy of the people of the United States, which is deep and universal, through their Government, would have an effect useful in very many ways to those people and to us.
>
> I am well aware that without the action of Congress, diplomatic relations could not be established, nor do I advise that course; but, should the President, in his message, referring to the struggles for liberty in this most interesting portion of the globe, suggest to Congress the propriety of opening such an intercourse, it would be of important service to these people and to human freedom, and it would give the Catholics of this country, and the world, the utmost gratification. Should you deem such a course proper, and should you direct the Secretary of State to send a copy of your message to me, with instructions to communicate it to the Pope, with such other instructions as you might think proper, it would afford me very great pleasure to be the humble (and if you please, private and confidential instrument) in such a beneficent policy, without any view to compensation or ulterior employment.[19]

Hamilton arrived in Rome in the evening of December 20, 1847. He was impressed by the "gorgeous" religious ceremony and by the fact that the people showed no interest whatever; to Hamilton they seemed as though they were at a spectacle where performers were trying to interest and amuse the spectators. The following extracts from Hamilton's diary reveal the keen interest he showed in the rapidly changing political situation that was developing in the Eternal City: [20]

[19] Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 356-357.

[20] Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 365-366.

December 27th, 1847.— . . . This evening, a numerous procession, with torches, went to the Quirinal Palace to receive the blessing of the Pope.

Angelo Brunetti,[20a] the tribune of the people, who was called by them Ciceruacchio (the fat boy), had been a dealer in wood; and having made a competency, had retired from that employment. On the morning of the ceremonial there was presented by him to the Pope, in writing, a list of twenty-eight demands; among others, that he should banish the Jesuits; and that he should establish commercial freedom. During the ceremonial, this man held a banner on which was inscribed: "The Roman people have many desires to express to their adored Sovereign; but they do not supplicate him, relying on the intercessions already employed by their great leader." He is the great man of the people; has greater influence over them than any other person, and has at times restrained their violence. He and they were (as wiser men declared to me) on this occasion guilty of a capital error.

These demands place the pope in a position of alternative that may obstruct, if they do not defeat, his proposed reforms. He cannot banish the Jesuits. That would be an act of gross injustice and oppression. They have too much power to be thus dealt with, whatever they may deserve. The other denominations of the Roman priesthood would make common cause on such an occasion; although generally they hate the Jesuits. If the pope refuses them, his hold upon the people . . . will be impaired.

January 1st, 1848.—There was to-day a strong popular movement. The people went to the Quirinal Palace, to ask the pope's decision. The Governor of the city ordered the guard to be doubled, and they drove the people from the palace.

January 2d.—The pope, in order to pacify, determined to make a detour, and to bless the people as he went along. In the Corso, Prince Orsini drove up to a house opposite to the Cafe Nuovo (where we had a window). The prince was cheered; he made an address; he was replied to. There was a banner displayed "Pio Nono, the guest of the people, if he will." This was distinct from any cortege of the pope, and had a significant relation to the previous demands . . .

On January 1, 1848, Hamilton became acquainted with some of the men who were understood to be the leaders in the popular movement, and from them he learned much of their affairs and of what

[20a] Angelo Brunetti (1800-49). In 1846 he became the idol of the Roman people. After the fall of the Republic, he fell into the hands of the Austrians, who executed him.

they complained, and the movements which were in progress. He prepared for one of those gentlemen, at his request, a paper containing such measures of reform as they desired, and he thought necessary. In this paper Hamilton endeavored to impress upon them the view "that personal liberty, the right to be free from arrest without a written warrant founded upon a charge made under oath, and from imprisonment until after an open, public examination, was the only sure foundation of public liberty." As a result of conversations he had on these subjects, Hamilton was able to learn a great deal about the papal government, and its various departments.[21] Of special significance to him were such vital matters as the tribunal of the vicar-general, the Rota, the growth in population, area, climate, revenue, and instruction. On this last point, his diary reads in part as follows:

> The people may be instructed by the Jesuits, but to a limited extent. The schools and colleges are supplied with masters from the clergy... The higher classes of people are ignorant, proud, and exclusive. The middle classes intelligent, industrious, and in good condition. The lower classes wicked, brutal, revengeful, and ignorant, powerful and robust physically, requiring only a good government to give them education, and encourage industry, to make them happy and contented. There is no country in the old world possessing such elements for prosperity.[22]

On the basis of all the information Hamilton was able to gather from leading Romans, on January 5, he addressed the following letter to James Buchanan, the Secretary of State of the United States:

> Rome (Italy), January 5, 1848.
>
> Sir: I have the honor to send to you, for the use of the Government and in the hope that they will be translated and published, various decrees called "*Motu proprio*," issued by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and also by the Pope, by which you will be informed of the extent of the concessions to public opinion which have been accorded by the respective sovereigns.
>
> It is to be remarked that the latter prince, wisely foreseeing the course of events, made his concessions in a timely manner, and not

[21] Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. 359.

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 359-361.

as the result of intimidation; whereas the former, although influenced as he always has been by a liberal spirit, delayed his purposes until tumultuous meetings forced them from him—and has thus placed himself in a position to be unable to refuse other demands which it might not be wise to yield, or to engage in a conflict with his people with arms in their hands.

The condition of public affairs in all the Italian states is exceedingly interesting. The people, ignorant and superstitious beyond any others in Europe, except perhaps the serfs of Russia, brutalized by a long course of despotism exercised over them, not only by their sovereigns but by the aristocracy and the clergy, are wholly unfitted for self-government. They are very excitable, and consequently are in the hands of factious leaders, who can at any time push them on to acts of outrage and a state of anarchy. This the sovereigns well understand; and being understood, it is to be feared they will neither yield or withhold wisely and timely.

The Pope hopes that the religious feelings of the people, and their affection for him personally, which is certainly very great, will enable him to control them. The universal apprehension of Austrian interference has certainly a salutary influence.

The Civic Guard (that is, an armed and embodied militia) has been established in Sardinia, in Tuscany, and in the Papal States.

The press is without restraint in Tuscany. In the Papal States it is nearly so. In Sardinia, it is legalized and extended, but is under a severe censorship. The Grand Duke of Tuscany has promised a Council of State and other reforms, as has the Sardinian King, while the Pope by his *motu proprio* of the 14th October, 1847, which is called here the Constitution, has created a *Consulta di Stato*, now merely advisory, which may, and will, ultimately usurp the power of legislation, hitherto and even yet exclusively belonging to and exercised by the sovereign, and which, as it merely represents the sovereign will and pleasure, is a pure despotism.

Connected with these and other very interesting views of political affairs here, which I forbear to dwell upon, allow me to express the wish, very universal here, among Americans, English, and the thinking portion of the Italians, that our Government should have diplomatic relations with all the powers of the peninsula, which might be in the person of one man accredited to Tuscany, Rome and Naples. We have a *chargé d'affaires* already in Sardinia, who is spoken of with great respect. A discreet, well informed, Protestant citizen, who could speak the French language, this being indispensable to the service, in the manner I refer to, might, by salutary counsels, be of important service, to the governments and the peoples.

I beg leave to say that in making these suggestions I have no view to such an employment, which I neither expect nor desire. I could not enter upon it.

I have the honor to be, with great respect, yours, &c.[23]

Three days later, on January 8, 1848, Hamilton prepared the following paper, at the request of "a gentleman of rank" in the government of the Sovereign Pontiff, with the understanding that it was to be conveyed by him to the Pope. The gentleman himself concurred in the views herein expressed:

> Common report says that the people, or a part of them, have prepared and sent to the Pope, a series of demands, twenty-eight in number, some deserving of consideration, and others not. Among these demands was one for the suppression of the Society of Jesus, and another for the abolition of lotteries. The question submitted is, how ought the Sovereign Pontiff to treat these demands.
>
> It is said that this paper was, in the course of transmission, diverted before it reached the eye of the Sovereign Pontiff, and that this was done to relieve him from embarrassment.
>
> With great submission to those who ought to understand the subject much better than the author of these reflections can be supposed to do, he states unhesitatingly that the arrestation of the paper was unwise, and a grievous fault against the Sovereign and his people.
>
> It is their right and duty to express in decorous language their grievances and wants, and it is his duty to receive these complaints and petitions, and give due heed to both. Such a mutual course will preserve authority on the one part, and confidence and affection on the other, and thus prevent outbreaks. Let it be understood by the people that their petitions cannot reach the holy and sovereign eye or ear, or that they are not to be considered by him as worthy of attention, and there will inevitably follow the destruction of that affection and mutual confidence upon which the peace of the present system and the progress of salutary reforms depend. Here was the fault to both parties. The folly was in temporizing with measures upon an occasion which required action and decision.
>
> The course taken was that one of all others which the enemy to the Pontiff and the people would have taken; and to it is, probably, to be in part attributed that suspicion of a want of confidence which seemed to have been felt by the people about the first day of the year, and which had like to have produced a crisis. The question is, however, not answered. There appears to me to be no difficulty attending the affair. On the contrary, it was one which could have been turned most manifestly to the advantage of his Holiness.
>
> His *Consulta di Stato* I understand to be an advisory body, which is supposed to represent the feelings, and to guard the interests of the

[23] Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 366-367.

whole country. They are the representatives of the people. The course to have been pursued in this (and on all like occasions) was, for the Holy Father to send this petition of the people to the people's representatives for their advice in relation to their requirements or grievances, accompanied by a message, in which occasion should have been taken by the sovereign to express his wish that his people, collectively or individually, high or low, should address to him their petitions; and that he desired rather to invite them to do so, than to repress such a spirit; making some allusion to its advantages, and with strong professions of his disposition to do full justice to all that should be so done decorously and considerately; also, reiterating his determination to promote all such reforms as were consistent with the stability of the throne, the sacredness of the Church, and the welfare of all classes of the people.

I would have advised that in this message he should have adverted to the demand for the exile of a certain class of his subjects as inadmissible; because, if granted, it would violate that sacred right of all his subjects from the highest to the most abject, to perfect security in their lives, liberty, property, and the enjoyment of their happy country, its wise institutions and sacred religion, unless deprived thereof for some offence against the laws, by a due course of trial and conviction.

The assertion of this maxim, upon which, certainly, is founded the whole civil and social system, would have been so gratifying to the people, as the sheet anchor of their hopes, and its reasonableness as applied to the order referred to, as well as to any other or to any individual, would be so clear, that they would have been satisfied.

These demands would thus be left to be disposed of by the Council of State, who would report thereon in due time, or not at all, as they should think proper or necessary; and thus, instead of impairing the confidence and affection of the people towards the sovereign, it would have been increased, and all responsibility would be thrown upon the representative and advisory body.

The adversaries to reform may be presumed to endeavor to push the people to make demands which cannot be granted, in the hope of destroying the existing relations between the sovereign and the people, and then to excite them to excesses.[24]

Meanwhile, Hamilton prepared the following statement which was copied and delivered to a person who was described as a leader of the people, who, in turn, engaged to have them translated into Italian, printed, and circulated:

[24] Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 367-368.

REFLECTIONS BY A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES IN ROME UPON THE POLITICAL CONDITION OF ITALY

The beneficent purposes of the Sovereign Pontiff, the permanency of reforms, their extension, the welfare of the people, the security of the Church and of the aristocracy depend,

First, Upon the truth and sincerity of the government;

Second, Upon the firmness and moderation of the people...

Third, That no man shall be deprived of his life, liberty or property, except by due course of law. This is the corner-stone of the whole civil and social system....

Fourth, That the Consulta di Stato shall be an integral part of the law-making power of the states.

These are demands which the people ought to make, and being granted, they ought to be satisfied, until by time and their own advancement the true principles of a civil liberty shall be understood by them, and then a limited monarchy with a representative legislature, and a due infusion of the democratic elements, so necessary to preserve the liberties of the people against the unceasing and universally successful encroachments of aristocracy and wealth might be established.[25]

The course of events in the Italian peninsula during the first two months of 1848 is carefully analyzed and summarized by Hamilton in a letter dated Rome, February 27, 1848, that he wrote to a "a friend in New York." Deploring the political degradation and the effects of an iron despotism especially in the Papal States, the Two Sicilies, and Sardinia, Hamilton continued:

The people of Tuscany, from the more liberal and enlightened administration of their prince, are in all respects much higher in the scale of civilization than the others.

This reform government, so interesting to us particularly, and which will make every despot in Europe tremble, commenced in the Eternal City.

The renowned Pio Nono, or Pius IX. commenced the Italian reforms; and to the popularity of his name and character is to be attributed, more than to any other circumstances, not only the popular impulse, but also the moderation of the people. He first established the 'Civic Guard,' and gave a very qualified freedom to the press; and 'without' as he said in his address to his consulta, 'having parted with a little of his power,' he still preserves absolute dominion over the hearts and minds of his subjects.

[25] Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 369-372

> The Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom, one of the fairest portions of Italy, is a province of Austria, and is nearly crushed by the iron heel of the Croat.
>
> I have examined with attention the course of events in all Middle and Southern Italy, and am entirely unable to form an opinion as to the probable course of these governments. It is quite clear that the masses, from their ignorance, their habitual servility, and their blind confidence in their priesthood, (who are, generally speaking, ignorant and demoralized), are not only entirely unfitted to govern themselves, but incapable of knowing what good government means. Whether wise and patriotic spirits will arise to moderate and direct the impulsive character of the people, or whether all will pass into a state of the wildest anarchy, it is impossible to foresee. But I am quite sure that the dominion of the Church of Rome over the minds and conduct of the people, which has been so absolute, must now come to an end. The hostility of the Jesuits, so deep and universal even in the Holy City, the seat of the power and wealth of that society, will extend to all the other orders of the priesthood. The reason of this fierce hostility to the former is merely because they have only more grossly deceived and oppressed the people than the others, and because they have had more power and greater opportunities to do so...[26]

A somewhat different view of the political scene in Rome during this period is presented by other American visitors. Caroline Matilda Stanbury Kirkland,[27] associate editor of the *Union Magazine*, travelled in Italy during June and July, 1848, observing some external aspects of the revolutionary uprisings. During a brief audience Pope Pius granted her, His Holiness told her of his love of liberty without which, he said, religion could not prosper. Pointing out the difference between him and the other sovereigns, the Pope stated that he had no ambition to extend his temporal dominion, although he was obliged to keep it inviolate. As head of the Church he desired peace on earth. Then His Holiness spoke very affably of America, stating that he looked to it with sympathy and affection, and that it always gave him pleasure to receive Americans. His Holiness spoke in French and Italian, using the latter only when he became over-excited in his conversation. He enunciated

[26] Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 361-364.

[27] C. M. S. Kirkland, *Holiday Abroad: or Europe, from the West*, (New York, 1849), 2 vols.

well, not at all spoiled by the tobacco he continued to take without interruption.[28]

Charles Edwards Lester, a great admirer of Italy and the Italians, was also received by His Holiness during this period. In his *Consulship*,[29] which gives an account of his services as United States Consul at Genoa from 1842 to 1847, Lester concluded that Pius IX had found the task of reforming the pontificate was no child's play; indeed it appeared that he had undertaken the impossible. The moment he had made known his intention of reorganizing the pontifical government, the Jesuits and the leaders of the reactionary faction, according to Lester, had brought all the machinery of their parties to bear against him. This machinery was stupendous, all-pervading, subtle; and, in the end, it proved irresistible.[30]

George Stillman Hillard visited Italy from September, 1847 to the spring of 1848. His impressions of the country are contained in his most substantial work, *Six Months in Italy*,[31] published in 1853. Hillard warned the traveller in Rome to leave all his notions of progress, representative government, railways, and reform at the gates, or he would find himself in a constant state of protest and rebellion. The visitor is advised to look upon pope, cardinal, and monk, not with a puritan scowl, but as parts of an imposing pageant, which he may contemplate without self-reproach, though without approving.[32] Though not referring specifically to Rome, Hillard concluded that just as we had no past, so Italy seemed to have no future. There, according to Hillard, humanity, weary with its long

[28] Prezzolini, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

[29] C. Edwards Lester, *My Consulship*, 2 vols. (New York, 1853); *The Artists of America*, (1846). His residence abroad gave opportunity for much study and writing, including translations from Machiavelli, Ceba, Alfieri, Azeglio, all of which he published in 1845. He also wrote the introduction to the Italian translation of Bancroft's *Storia degli Stati Uniti* (Turin, Pomba, 1847). Lester arrived in Rome, March 18, 1848, from Leghorn.

[30] Lester, *op. cit.*, II, 231.

[31] George Stillman Hillard, *Six Months in Italy*, (Boston, 1853); *Dictionary of American Biography*, IX, 49-50; Prezzolini, *op. cit.* Hillard arrived in Rome March 25, 1848 from Naples, and departed from Rome on April 9, 1848, for Florence.

[32] Hillard, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-131.

journey, and faint with its protracted struggles, had sunk into a state which was half slumber and half despair.[33]

This feeling of despondency for the future of Italy at the beginning of 1848 was shared by Margaret Fuller, who, less than four months earlier had written most enthusiastically of the papal reforms and of their effects on the destiny of Italy. It should be noted, however, that Margaret Fuller's ardent love of freedom and sacrifices for it, soon brought her under the influence of the leaders of the revolutionary forces that were then organizing in Rome. In the letter to Emerson dated Rome, April 30, 1848, Miss Fuller wrote that "those who loved him [Pius IX] can no longer defend him," and that though "his person as a Pope is still respected, his character as a man is despised." [34]

John Tyler Headley, an historian, was also very critical of the Pope's change of policy. Headley admitted that Pius IX was doubtless a more liberal and better man than his predecessor, but argued that what he had done towards establishing constitutional government in his domain had been forced from him by the revolutionary movement in Europe. The grand excitement occasioned by his reform, wrote Headley, and the extravagant hopes expressed, were altogether too premature.[35]

Nevertheless, the enthusiasm in America for the liberal reforms of the Pope continued unabated, with the result that the President of the United States in his annual message to Congress in 1847 recommended the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Holy See. As early as January, 1848, the *Gazzetta di Roma*,[36] announced the fact that the President of the United States had asked for the necessary funds to establish an "embassy" at Rome. The newspaper also reported that "all" the press in America applauded the move to establish an "embassy" at the Holy See, as a proof of the "immense fame" Pius IX enjoyed in America. According to the *Gazzetta di Roma* the ap-

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 560-561.

[34] Ossoli, *op. cit.*, III, 172.

[35] J. T. Headley, *Letters from Italy*, p. viii.

[36] *Gazzetta di Roma*, Rome, January 18, 1848: 8.

pointee was to be Mr. Vanburgh Livingston, a recent convert to Catholicism. As a special tribute to His Holiness, the American government had decided to appoint a Catholic. The newspaper also stated that the President of the United States had summoned Msgr. John Hughes, Bishop of New York, to Washington to seek his advice concerning the appointment to be made to the Holy See. Although Mr. Livingston had the support of the *Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register*[37] which revealed his accomplished manners and private virtues, the appointment ultimately went to Jacob L. Martin,[38] who presented his letter of credence to the Cardinal Secretary of State, on August 19, 1848.[39] Martin's interview was brief and confined to the cordial exchanges of the customary civilities.

On this occasion Mr. Martin made, in French, the substance of an address to which His Eminence replied in corresponding terms. Mr. Martin's address was published in Rome's official journal, and since the copy he sent to James Buchanan, the Secretary of State, with his despatch dated Rome, August 20, 1848, has presumably been lost,[40] it will be well to record here the Italian version of the address as published in the *Gazzetta di Roma*.[41]

> Nell'atto che ho l'onore di presentare a Vostra Eminenza, sig. Cardinale, la lettera che mi accredita come Incaricato d'Affari degli Stati Uniti presso la S. Sede, reputo mio primo dovere il soddisfare al piacevole incarico di assicurarla dei sentimenti di cordiale amicizia e di alta stima, che provano il Presidente e il Popolo degli Stati Uniti per l'illustre Pontefice, il di cui regno ha apportato tanto splendore alla S. Sede, come anche alla bella ed antica nazione che tante volte ha fatto echeggiare il mondo della sua gloria, o lo ha rallegrato del suo splendore.

[37] *Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register*, November 20, 1847.

[38] Jacob L. Martin, chief clerk of the Department of State, 1840-41, Secretary of State *ad interim* March 3-4, 1841. He was secretary of the American Legation in France, 1844-47, acting as chargé for several months. For other details concerning Martin's mission to Rome, cf. the works of Feiertag, this author's own, and Leo Francis Stock's *United States Ministers to the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches 1848-1868* (Washington, 1933).

[39] *Gazzetta di Roma*, August 19, 1848, 653.

[40] Stock, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[41] *Gazzetta di Roma*, August 22, 1848, 661.

M'incombe quidi di dire al tempo stesso a Vostra Eminenza, che il Presidente e il Popolo americano hanno riguardato con viva soddisfazione i nobili tentativi di Sua Santità per migliorare la sorte del popolo che il Cielo Le ha dato in custodia; tentativi egualmente coraggiosi ed illuminati, i quali danno a sperare che sì illustre Pontefice diverrà l'instrumento della Provvidenza per istabilire la vera libertà, la sola che può praticarsi; fondata cioè sulla religione, sull'ordine, sull'istruzione morale e intelletuale del popolo. Quegli che ha richiamato l'esule nel seno della sua desolata famiglia, Quegli che ha mandato ad effetto tante nobili ed utili riforme, possa cominciare a godere sulla terra la ricompensa riservata nel Cielo alle buone opere, che meritando la riconoscenza del Suo Popolo gli hanno attirato l'ammirazione di tutto il mondo!

Sono bene fortunato di essere l'interprete di tali sentimenti, e di avere questa opportunità per assicurare l'Eminenza Vostra che sarò ben pago della fiducia di cui il Presidente mi ha onorato, s'Ella sopratutto mi porgerà occasione di stringere i buoni rapporti fra i due Governi, le cui relazioni non possono non essere scambievolmente utili e soddisfacenti.

The Pope, on receiving Mr. Martin, expressed his pleasure in entering into a treaty with so "great a nation, especially with one in which the Church has nothing to fear from the Government, nor the Government from the Church." Mr. Martin died suddenly on the morning of August 26, just a week after he had presented his letter of credence. Martin's death was universally regretted. "It is true that he had been in Rome but a short time, wrote "W. S. B." to Horace Greeley, from Rome on September 14, 1848, "but he came as the representative of a country well known and greatly admired." There was not, this correspondent said, any other nation so universally mentioned with respect and praise by the Italians as the United States, and he doubted if the ministers of any other government "could do as much to allay the troubled waters of Europe by their advice." [42]

In an account of the funeral honors paid to Mr. Martin on August 28, the *Gazzetta di Roma* [43] stated that his remains were accompanied to the Protestant cemetery near the pyramid of Cajo Cestio on Via Ostiense by the members of the diplomatic corps and other prominent citizens in their respective carriages. A regiment of dragoons accompanied the funeral procession.

[42] New York *Daily Tribune*, October 23, 1848.

[43] *Gazzetta di Roma*, August 31, 1848, 693.

Mr. J. C. Hooker, who took charge of Mr. Martin's affairs, immediately notified Mr. Buchanan, and the Honorable Richard Rush, the United States Minister in Paris, of the death of the chargé. The following hitherto unpublished correspondence was exchanged between Mr. Hooker and Mr. Rush on the death of Martin:

28 August 1848.[44]
Rome

Hon. Richard Rush,
Paris,

Dear Sir:

It is my painful duty to inform you of the death of J. L. Martin, Esq., Chargé d'Affaires to the Court of Rome. He reached here a few weeks since bringing with him a credit to the Banking House of which I am a partner, Parkenheim, Hooker. There being but two Americans in Rome besides myself, I saw him frequently. He lodged in a very unhealthy but pleasant situation. I urged him strongly to remove, and told him he was perilling his life. He intended to leave town in a few days. On Thursday 24th he spent an hour or so with me. On Friday not seeing him I called in the evening and found he had been confined all day to his bed with a fever. I at once went for a doctor who gave him proper medicine. In the morning between 8 and 9 I called again. He told me he felt much better, and that he thought the doctor understood his case and that his medicines had had the proper effect. He spoke to me about his affairs and of his wishing to send off the despatch to M. Buchanan—of his reception here.[45] I told him I would aid him when he was ready, and to send into the bank, quite near, for me. The doctor visited him about 9 and gave him a medicine to take every hour. He told his servant that he would try and sleep a little and to call him at the hour. The servant went and found him quite dead They called me immediately. He appeared as if sleeping. His hands were closed and he had been dead some time.

Every attention was paid him. He said he was carefully [illegibile] when I proposed to him to come to my lodgings. He had cupping glasses with him and we think it was apoplexy that killed him. His effects have been sealed up with the exception of the despatch which has been sent to Mr. Buchanan. His papers were placed in a trunk. I shall pay the expenses of his funeral and lodgings etc. with some money which he had from our house. I shall have the vice consul

[44] MS in National Archives. Originally found in the Archives of the American Embassy, Paris.

[45] Cf. Stock, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-15.

make a list for messrs. Greene.[46] He mentioned to me he had some Roman bonds, which some sisterhood of nuns had given him to collect the interest upon. I think he told me they lived in Belgium.

The Pope has taken the matter quite to heart. He sent for me to give the particulars of his death. He said he had taken great pleasure in receiving Mr. Martin, and that he felt sure our country could not send many such men and that he had congratulated himself in having him near him. His effects are in the hands of the vice consul[47] — the consul being absent.

His funeral takes place this afternoon, there are some 8 Americans in Rome, but I did not know but one or two (besides myself).

If you are acquainted with his affairs and can suggest of anything being done here, I shall be most happy to serve. I know none of his friends, but have written to Mr. Buchanan an account of his death.[48]

I beg to enclose circular of our establishment at Rome.

Your most obdt. servant

J. C. Hooker.

Rome, 30 August 1848.[49]

Hon. Richard Rush,
Paris.

Sir:

A despatch from Washington, and two letters for Mr. Martin were brought to me this morning.

I have sent them to the Vice Consul, Antoine Ardisson. As Mr. Brown[50] the Consul is absent and it is not known where he is. I thought it might be prudent for me to inform you of the arrival of the despatch thinking it might be of some importance, and that you might be empowered to receive it.

The Pope sent a detachment of dragoons to escort Mr. Martin's remains to the grave, and his funeral was attended by the diplomatic corps generally.

[46] When Martin arrived in Rome, he brought with him a credit from Messrs. Greene & Co., on the house of which Hooker was a partner—for 3000 francs. Stock, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

[47] Antoine Ardisson, appointed vice consul in 1846.

[48] For the text of the letter, see Stock, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

[49] MS National Archives. Originally found in the Archives of the American Embassy, Paris.

[50] Nicholas Browne. Consul in Rome, 1845-49. For the part Browne played in the disturbances that occurred in Rome in 1848-49, cf. Marraro, "Unpublished American Documents" in the *Catholic Historical Review*, XXVIII (Jan. 1943), 459-490.

I selected a spot of ground for his burial near several of our countrymen.[51] His death is very much lamented. There were present 8 Americans at his burial.

We had congratulated ourselves on the appointment, as he was a representative whom his countrymen were not obliged to apologize for—as they have some in Italy.

I have the honor to be,

Your obdt. servant.

J. C. Hooker.

Legation of the United States,[52]
Paris, September 9, 1848.

J. C. Hooker, Esq.,
Rome.

Dear Sir:

I have received your two letters informing me of the sudden death of Mr. Martin, Chargé d'Affaires of the United States at Rome. The information shocked and grieved me. I deplore his loss. I knew him well, his fine principles, and talents, his generous nature and great worth. His country sustains a loss at Rome. Your kind attention could not have been bestowed upon a person more worthy of them, and as one of his friends I thank you.

I am not acquainted with his private affairs. He has or had a female relative in Paris, a cousin I believe, to whom I immediately sent the intelligence, but she was then out of town. She shall know it as soon as she returns.

The despatch and letters mentioned in your second letter, August 30, which arrived for him at Rome after his death, I have no authority to open or take charge of; and I do not know that you could have done better with them for the present than deliver them to the vice consul of the United States, in whose hands his effects are, the Consul being absent. You also did well to inform Mr. Buchanan, Secretary of State, of his death.

Thanking you for the information you gave me of the particulars, and of the honors the Pope did to his memory, I remain,

dear Sir, Your,

Richard Rush.

[51] This might disprove the statement made in a letter printed in the *Boston Transcript*, September 27, 1848, to the effect that Martin became a Catholic before his death. Cf. Stock, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

[52] MS National Archives. Originally found in the Archives of the American Embassy, Paris.

In the following unpublished letter dated Paris, September 9, 1848, addressed to Mr. Buchanan, Richard Rush paid his tribute to Mr. Martin's sterling qualities of character, expressing his grief on the great loss the government and country had suffered:

Legation of the United States,[53]
Paris, September 9, 1848.

Hon. James Buchanan,
Secretary of State.

I received this week, though late to write to you by Liverpool Steamer, two letters from Mr. J. C. Hooker, a citizen of New York established as a banker at Rome, informing me of the sudden death in that capital on the 26th of August of Mr. Martin, a few days after he had presented his credentials to the Pope, as our Chargé d'Affaires. Although I am aware from it that he immediately communicated the sad event to you, yet as I do not know if he mentioned the same particulars as to me; and as his second letter, of August 30th, mentions a dispatch and two letters for him that arrived at Rome after his death which possibly you may not have heard of, I deem it best to send you herewith copies of both his letters with a copy of my answer dated to-day, by which it will be seen what I have said to him about the despatch and letters in question.

Mr. Martin had been so long and usefully connected with this Legation, and had left it so recently for the honorable post to which the President had promoted him as a tribute to his merits, that it would seem also, apart from the above motive, my natural though painful task to speak to you of his decease. The United States sustains a loss by it in their diplomatic service; for to shining mental accomplishments and strong and cultivated talents, he added a generous nature, and those kindly personal qualities and manners which gain an influence auxiliary to the attainment of public objects. His superior endowments seem to have won, at first flush, all the respect and best feelings of the Pope, and the funeral honors which he accorded to his remains, cannot but be grateful to the President. Cut off in the prime of life whilst just entering upon a new and important field of service, I ask leave to mingle my respectful condolence with the President and yourself on the occasion of his death.

I have the honor,

Richard Rush.

[53] MS National Archives. Originally found in the Archives of the American Embassy, Paris.

Meanwhile, the political situation in Rome was becoming increasingly perilous for the Pope and his advisers. Margaret Fuller, who had by this time become very active in the political affairs of the Roman revolutionists, described the situation in letters she wrote to friends during this period. In a letter to Emerson, dated Rome, October 18, 1848, she stated that while she "sympathized with the warm love of the people," still "the adulation of leading writers, who were willing to take all from the Prince of the Church as a gift and a bounty, instead of steadily implying that it was the right of the people, was very repulsive" to her. She praised Crawford, the American sculptor, for his decision to join the Republican Guard. Miss Fuller referred with disdain to the "many Americans in Italy" who talked about the corrupt and degenerate state of Italy "as they do of our slaves at home." [54]

About a month later, on November 23, 1848, Miss Fuller wrote to "M. S." that Mazzini had waged "a great fight" against folly, compromise, and treason; and that he was "steadfast in his convictions and of almost miraculous energy to sustain." Referring to His Holiness, Miss Fuller "grieved" to say that "the good-natured Pio" had shown himself "utterly derelict," alike without resolution to abide by the good or the ill. She wrote that the people no longer trusted his word, since they knew that the cardinals were misusing his name to violate his pledge.[55]

But Margaret Fuller was not the only American who criticized the Pope's conduct at this time. Other Americans said that Pius IX was an ardent patriot and desired with all his heart the liberation of Italy from Austrian rule, but knew that a declaration of war upon Austria at that time would be fatal to Italian independence and would rivet the alien bonds more firmly than ever, since Italy in her weakness and dissension was in no condition to cope with a strong and settled power. Others asserted that the United States had altogether overrated the Pope as a politician, for he lacked the energy to accomplish what he honestly desired and confidently believed would be for the best. "W. S. B." in a letter from Rome

[54] Ossoli, *op. cit.*, III, 156, 157.

[55] Ossoli, *op. cit.*, III, 194-195.

to Horace Greeley declared that the Pope had not so much originated the measures which had given him such great fame, as he had submitted to a demand " clamorously " made by the exigencies of the times when he ascended the papal throne. Soon, however, this writer said, influences had been brought to bear upon the Pope which had resulted in a complete reversal of his measures and the restoration to this ministry of Count Pellegrino Rossi, the very man who, of all others, was most objectionable to the people, and whose previous dismissal had been the first step toward liberalism. Rossi, who had once acted as an envoy for Louis Philippe, was denounced as a Frenchman and an enemy to Italy.[56]

Mrs. Mary Crawford Fraser, wife of an American diplomat, felt that " it was an ungrateful task to charge the memory of such a man as Pius IX with vacillation ", but she too felt that his policy at this crisis could not be otherwise described.[57]

So strong was the feeling against the policy of the Pope at this time that when Pellegrino Rossi, the papal minister, was assassinated on November 15, 1848, Margaret Fuller wrote that so general was the sense of relief throughout the Papal States at the murder of Rossi, that it affected persons who, if they had consulted their private consciences alone, would have been deeply indignant at the crime. Ossoli wrote to her mother: " For me, I never thought to have heard of a violent death with satisfaction; but this act affected me as one of terrible justice." [58]

The political situation in Rome obliged Pius IX to seek refuge in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, from where he appealed to the Catholic nations and to the United States for support. The text of the Pope's appeal to the President of the United States has not been found, but, as shown in the following letter to Buchanan, hitherto unpublished, it was transmitted through Richard Rush of Paris, since Lewis Cass Jr., Martin's successor to Rome, had not yet reached his post.

[56] New York *Daily Tribune*, October 21, 1848.

[57] Mrs. Hugh Fraser, *A Diplomatist's Wife in Many Lands*, (New York, 1910), I, 23.

[58] Ossoli, *op. cit.*, III, 186.

No. 68. Legation of the United States,[59]
Paris, Dec. 18, 1848.

Hon. James Buchanan,
Secretary of State,
Sir:

Late last night I received from the Pope's Nuncio in Paris, the Archbishop of Nice, the enclosed letter[60] to the President from His Holiness the Pope, the purport of which I am informed, is to appeal to the generous sentiments of the President in the unfortunate situation in which he has been placed by the events which occurred at Rome in November.

The Nuncio has requested that I will forward the letter as soon as possible; and I am glad that it has arrived in time, though coming at the last moments, to go by the Steamer Washington from Southampton on Wednesday with my dispatch of day before yesterday.

I have the honor,
Richard Rush.

When Mazzini established the republic, Miss Fuller wrote of him as a man of genius, and an "elevated thinker." But the most powerful and first impressions from his presence was, she said, always of the religion of the soul, of his virtue. If clearness of right, if energy, if indefatigable perseverance, could steer the ship through this dangerous pass, she declared, it would be done. Miss Fuller was grieved to find that there were Americans in Rome who had no confidence in the Republic because "they had no confidence in the people." They said that the Italians were not fit for a democratic republic; that they required more preparation for it.[61]

In a letter to "M. S." dated Rome, March 9, 1849, Miss Fuller gave a vivid description of Mazzini's arrival in Rome, his visit to her home, and her impressions of his plans. She felt certain that if anyone could save Italy from her foes, inward and outward, it was he; and unhappily, she said, he was "the only great Italian." She grieved that she could not help him; freely would she have

[59] MS National Archives. Originally found in the Archives of the American Embassy, Paris.

[60] No mention of this document is made in Stock's *United States Ministers to the Papal States.*

[61] New York *Daily Tribune*, April 4, 1849.

given her life, she said, to aid him, "only bargaining for a quick death," since she did not like "slow torture." [62]

In April, 1849, Miss Fuller was appointed, by the Roman Commission for the Succor of the Wounded, to the charge of the hospital of the Fate-Bene Fratelli; the Princess Belgioioso having charge of the one already opened. The following is a copy of the original letter from the princess, which is written in English, informing Miss Fuller of her appointment.

Comitato di Soccorso Pei Feriti,[63]
April 30, 1849

Dear Miss Fuller:

You are named Regolatrice of the Hospital of the *Fate-Bene Fratelli*. Go there at twelve, if the alarm bell has not rung before. When you arrive there, you will receive all the women coming for the wounded, and give them your directions, so that you are sure to have a certain number of them night and day.

May God help us,

Christine Trivulze,
of Belgioioso

Miss Fuller,
Piazza Barberini, No. 60.

In his diary, William Wetmore Story left a vivid account of the part played by Miss Fuller and other Americans in Rome during the fighting which took place between the French troops and the Romans led by Garibaldi.[64]

At about this time the public-spirited citizens in Rome raised a total of 191.84½ scudi for the care of the wounded soldiers in the hospitals. According to an announcement published in the *Monitore Romano*,[65] the following donations were made:

[62] Ossoli, *op. cit.*, III, 208-209.

[63] Fuller, *op. cit.*, III, 210.

[64] H. James, *William W. Story*, (Boston, 1903), I, 151-160. On the arrival of the French troops at Civitavecchia and the part played by Lewis Cass Jr., our minister, who had recently arrived in Rome, cf. Marraro, "Unpublished . . .", *Catholic Historical Review*, XXVIII (Jan. 1943).

[65] *Monitore Romano: giornale officiale della Repubblica*, May 3, 1849, 412.

	Scudi
A German lady	2.50
Americans	101.62
The Chamber of Commerce	50.00
Giuseppe Dippel	1.00
Public collection	36.72½
Total	191.84½

Story's account of the anxiety which prevailed during the military engagements between the French and the Garibaldians is corroborated by other eye-witnesses. "N. B." in a letter from Rome, dated May 15, 1849, to the *Evening Post*, referred among other things to the "glorious victory" achieved by the Roman troops and citizens on Monday, April 30, adding: "Who shall dare to say that the Romans are incapable of defending their Republic? Even the French themselves declare their utter amazement at the result."[66]

The fact was, according to another Rome correspondent, that the interference of the French aroused the weakest to resistance. "From the Austrians, from the Neapolitans," they cried, "we expected this; but from the French, it is too infamous, it cannot be borne," and they all ran to arms and fought nobly.[67]

Miss Fuller in a letter to "E. S." dated Rome, June 6, 1849, gave an eye-witness description of a terrible battle fought at Villa Pamfili. The Romans lost three hundred men killed and wounded; the French lost more. She said that she had found the wounded men at the hospital in a transport of indignation. The French soldiers had fought so furiously, she wrote, that the wounded men thought them to be as false as their general.[68]

Four days later, on June 10, 1849, Miss Fuller wrote to Emerson that the Italians had fought like "lions". They were animated by a truly heroic spirit, she said, though there was little ground for hope that they could resist, since they had been betrayed by France.[69] Mrs. William W. Story, friend of Margaret Fuller, writes of her as follows:

[66] New York *Evening Post*, June 27, 1849.

[67] New York *Daily Tribune*, June 5, 1849.

[68] Ossoli, *op. cit.*, III, 206-208.

[69] Ossoli, *op. cit.*, III, 211.

> Night and day, Margaret was occupied, and, with the Princess (Belgiojoso), so ordered and disposed the hospitals, that their conduct was truly admirable. All the work was skillfully divided, so that there was no confusion or hurry; and, from the chaotic condition in whch these places had been left by the priests, who previously had charge of them, they brought them to a state of perfect regularity and discipline. Of money they had very little; and they were obliged to give their time and thoughts in its place. From the Americans in Rome they raised a subscription for the aid of the wounded of either party; but beside this they had scarcely any means to use. I have walked through the wards with Margaret, and saw how comforting was her presence to the poor suffering men.[70]

The Roman Republicans fought valiantly but were ultimately forced to surrender to the French, who entered Rome on July 2, 1849. A "supplement" of the *Monitore Romano*[71] published the following statement on the number of wounded in the various engagements fought:

Romans	136
From Roman State	543
Italians	322
Foreign	41
Unknown nationality	256
Total	1,298

The newspaper revealed also that up to June 25, 1849, the hospital registers showed 106 deaths.

Americans who had played a prominent role in the affairs of the Roman Republic felt despondent after the entrance of the French troops into Rome. Miss Fuller did not hesitate to write to "R.F.F." on July 8, 1849, that her own hopes had fallen with the hopes of Italy and that life looked too difficult to her.[72] In a letter written later in the same month to "S.H.", Miss Fuller described her grief in having to leave Rome and abandon the wounded and helpless soldiers in the power of a mean and vindictive foe. She could have provided for some of the poorer men with a small sum, and could

[70] H. Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, (New York, 1868), pp. 187-188.

[71] *Monitore Romano*, Rome, July 4, 1849, supplement.

[72] Ossoli, *op. cit.*, III, 216.

she have sold her "hair, or blood from her arm," she would have done it. Miss Fuller believed that had any of the rich Americans remained in Rome, they would have given her the money; they had helped "nobly" at first, she said, in the service of the hospitals, when there was far less need; but they had all left Rome.[73] She was sensibly touched by the noble and heroic courage of the wounded Romans. In a letter from Rieti, dated August 28, 1849, she wrote how one "fair young man," who had been made a cripple for life, clasped her hand as he saw her crying over the spasms she could not relieve, and faintly cried: "Viva l'Italia." "Think only, cara bona donna," said another poor wounded soldier, "that I can always wear my uniform on festas, just as it is now, with the holes where the balls went through, for a memory."[74]

On August 11, 1849, Miss Fuller wrote from Rome that though the Republic was overthrown, the defence of Rome had accomplished its part for freedom. It had proved to the world, she said, that Italians were not the cowards they had been represented; and better still, it had proved to Italians themselves that they only needed union to be strong, and that they might yet hope to drive every foreign oppressor from their soil.[75]

With Ossoli and her child, Margaret eventually reached Florence, where she took her husband's name and the title of Marchesa. She spent the winter writing a history of the Roman revolution. Of this book, which was never to be published, Mrs. Browning said: "It would have been more equal to her faculties than anything she had ever yet produced." In the spring the manuscript was finished, and Margaret prepared to return to America to find a publisher. But the ship on which she was returning with her husband and young child shipwrecked off Fire Island.[76]

Another American who played a leading role in the Roman revolution was Thomas Crawford, the sculptor, who had been in Rome since 1835, and therefore spoke Italian well, and had many Italian

[73] *Ibid.*, III, 218.

[74] *Ibid.*, III, 119-120.

[75] New York *Daily Tribune*, September 25, 1849.

[76] *Dictionary of American Biography*, VII, 63-66.

friends. He understood the mind and character of the Italian people as few foreigners did. When the Revolution of 1848 broke out, Crawford joined the Civic Guard as officer, and took part in the preparations that were made for the defence of Rome, notwithstanding his American citizenship. He left Rome on March 25, 1849, for Marseilles, visited America for several months, and then returned to Rome on October 15, 1850, there to spend the next six years in unremitting labor.[77]

George Perkins Marsh visited Rome in 1849, on his way to his post in Turkey where President Taylor had appointed him minister. He was a great admirer and student of the Italian people. His wife, Caroline Crane Marsh, writing of his visit to Rome in 1849, said:

> The people of Italy excited his liveliest interest and he lost no opportunity of studying their character and condition. He was greatly struck by their almost incredible quickness of comprehension, by their ready and sincere sympathy with every form of human suffering when not under the influence of some violent passion, by their patient endurance of physical privations, and, perhaps most of all, by the strength of their patriotism, which still believed that their Italy, though so cruelly betrayed by the Pope, and trampled upon by France, would one day live again and be free—a nation among nations. It was this faith, which was so general among the classes of the Italians, and for which so many had shown themselves ready to die, and more than die, that in 1849, inspired Mr. Marsh with a like faith, from which he never afterward swerved, however dark the prospect.[78]

These views were shared by William Ware, Unitarian clergyman of Hingham, Mass., who, in 1848-49, spent more than a year in Europe, residing chiefly in Italy. Upon his return he delivered a course of lectures in several cities, which he published in 1851 under the title of *Sketches of European Capitals*.[79] In this book

[77] *Dictionary of American Biography*, IV, 524; Samuel Osgood, *Thomas Crawford* (1875); Thomas Hicks, *Thomas Crawford: Career, Character and Works* (New York, 1858).

[78] C. C. Marsh, *Life and Letters of George Perkins Marsh*, (New York, 1888), I, 148. In 1861 Mr. Marsh was appointed the first diplomatic representative of the United States to Italy; he held this post to his death in 1882.

[79] William Ware, *Sketches of European Capitals*, (Boston, 1851), p. 196.

Ware frankly admitted that he came to like, and even love, what he was able to see and know of the Italians and the Italian character. He had sympathized with the Italians in their brief hour of political prosperity, and now pitied them in their reverses and disappointment. Ware had observed that the modern Italians were not a warlike people, but the contrary. Yet they were lovers of liberty, like their ancestors, but they were "too amiable a people, and too averse to war, to be ever able to secure their just rights." He deplored the petty jealousies among the Italians, and the lack of the spirit of union among their many states.

Ware found that as the Italian loves liberty, "at least theoretically," so did he love religion, "at least as a form and a dogma." He noted, however, what is religion to an Italian, is superstition to an American. It is this grand misapprehension as to what religion means and ought to be, which conducted directly to the formation of those parts of the Italian character which were obnoxious to common censure. After outlining Pope Pius' career from his "unexpectedly liberal policy," to the complete return of "the rule of despotism and darkness," Ware concluded: "To *see* him leads a Protestant to some new conclusions on the subject of Popery, and would go far to dissipate any lurking desire he might before have cherished for that form of Christianity." In his personal character, Pius IX was a pure and amiable person; his countenance indicated "amiability" and "weakness" as well.[80]

Several dignitaries of the Catholic Church visited Rome during this period. Among them was Archbishop John Hughes of New York who took an active part in the political affairs of the Papal States. In 1850, when New York was created an archdiocese, the newly created archbishop determined to go to Rome to be invested with the pallium by the Holy Father himself. While in Rome he took in the celebration in honor of St. Thomas à Becket at the English College, and in January, 1851, he delivered a course of controversial sermons, in English, to large congregations of English, Irish, and American residents of Rome, in the Church of San Andrea del Frate. He was chosen to pronounce the panegyric of St. Agatha on her festival, which was celebrated at Rome with

[80] Ware, *op. cit.*, pp. 216-219.

Name	Profession	Date of arrival in Rome	From City	Date of Departure from Rome	Destination
Adams, Joseph Alexander	Wood Engraver	I–14–50 IX–15–50	Florence Naples	- - -	- - -
Allen, William	Clergyman Educator	II–1–49 III–30–50	Naples Civita-vecchia	IV–16–50	Naples
Aspinwall, Wm. Henry	Merchant	I–26–50	Florence	- - -	- - -
Babcock, George H.	Engineer Inventor	V–2–50	Naples	- - -	- - -
Bacon, Leonard	Congrega-tional Clergyman	XII–23–50	Leghorn	- - -	- - -
Bailey, Joseph	Engineer	XII–27–50	Florence	VIII–3–50	Naples
Banks, Nathaniel P.	Congressman Gov. of Mass.	XII–8–50	Florence	- - -	- - -
Barnes, Albert	Presbyterian Clergyman	- - -	- - -	III–25–48	Marseilles
Bayley, James Roosevelt	Catholic Bishop	- - -	- - -	III–16–48	Naples
Bellows, Henry Whitney	Unitarian Clergyman	- - -	- - -	VII–6–48	Naples
Bergh, Henry	Pioneer in humane treatment of animals	III–1–49	Florence	III–11–49	Florence
Bidwell, Walter Hilliard	Editor Publisher	VIII–12–49	Naples	- - -	- - -
Bradley, Charles M.	Diplomat Sinologist	III–25–48	Naples	- - -	- - -
Brisbane, Albert	Social Reformer	- - -	- - -	XII–11–48	Naples
Brown, George	Pioneer railroad promoter	III–25–48 II–8–49 XII–25–50	Leghorn Naples Florence	IV–4–49 - - -	Florence - - -
Bruce, George	Typefounder	- - -	- - -	IX–15–50	Florence
Bryan, Thomas Barbour	Lawyer	- - -	- - -	III–17–48	Naples
Buchanan, James	Consul	- - -	- - -	IV–1–48	Florence
Bullock, William	Inventor Manufacturer	X–7–49	Florence	X–21–49	Naples
* Cass, Lewis, Jr.	Chargé d'affaires	IV–2–49 III–26–50	Marseilles Florence	- - - - - -	- - - - - -
Chadwick, Henry	Sportswriter	IV–19–50	Naples	V–29–50	Florence

Name	Profession	Date of arrival in Rome	From City	Date of Departure from Rome	Destination
Connelly, Cornelia	Foundress of Soc. of Holy Child Jesus	- - -	- - -	V-17-48	England
Cooke, Josiah P.	Chemist	III-5-49	Naples	III-15-49 IV-25-50	Florence Genoa
Cooper, James	U. S. Senator	- - -	- - -	III-12-48	Milan
Cranch, Christopher Pearse	Painter, critic, Unitarian minister	- - -	- - -	IV-13-48	Naples
Crawford, Thomas	Sculptor	X-15-50	Leghorn	III-25-49	Marseilles
Cropsey, Jaspar Francis	Painter	- - -	- - -	V-16-48	Naples
Curtis, George Wm.	Author-Orator	X-17-49	Turin	XI-14-49	Naples
Drayton, Percival	Naval Officer	II-25-50	Naples	- - -	- - -
Emerson, George Barrell	Educator	- - -	- - -	V-27-48	Tuscany
Fenllosa, Emmanuel	Musician	IV-17-48	Florence	- - -	- - -
Field, Cyrus West	Capitalist, promotor of first Atlantic Cable	VII-28-49	Leghorn	VIII-9-49	Naples
Field, David Dudley	Clergyman Reformer	XI-3-50	Leghorn	- - -	- - -
Fleming, Wm. M.	Actor	IX-24-49	Milan	- - -	- - -
Fletcher, James Cooley	Protestant Missionary	II-18-50	Geneva	- - -	- - -
Fuller, Sarah Margaret	Critic-Journalist	- - -	- - -	V-28-48	Naples
Furness, Wm. Henry	Unitarian Clergyman	IV-17-48	Naples	V-23-48	Florence
Gibbes, Robert Wilson	Physician Scientist	III-4-49	Naples	III-22-49	Malta
Gillespie, Wm. Mitchell	Civil Engineer	- - -	- - -	III-13-48	Naples
Gould, Benjamin	Astronomer	- - -	- - -	III-10-48	Florence
*Gould, William M.	Proprietor	- - -	- - -	V-8-48	Florence
Greenough, Henry	Architect Painter	IX-23-50	Marseilles	- - -	- - -
Greenough, Horatio	Sculptor	IV-13-50	Naples	- - -	- - -
Hamilton, James Alex.	Politician	- - -	- - -	XI-1-49	Naples

Name	Profession	Date of arrival in Rome	From City	Date of Departure from Rome	Destination
Hart, Joel Tanner	Sculptor	XII–30–49	Leghorn	– – –	– – –
Hayward, George	Surgeon	– – –	– – –	XII–7–50	Naples
Hillard, George Stillman	Literateur Lawyer	III–25–48	Naples	III–10–48? IV–9–48	Florence
Hitchcock, E. A	Author	II–18–50	Naples	III–6–50	Florence
Holt, Joseph	Secretary of War Judge	X–23–48	Leghorn	– – –	– – –
Hooker, Joseph	Dispatch Official	X–23–49	Marseilles	– – –	– – –
Hoppin, James M.	Teacher of Religion and Art	IV–17–48	Naples	– – –	– – –
Howe, George	Clergyman Historian Educator	IV–6–50	Naples	– – –	– – –
Hughes, John	Catholic Bishop	XII–27–50	Leghorn	– – –	– – –
Hunt, Wm. Morris	Painter	IV–17–50	Leghorn	– – –	– – –
Hurlbut, Wm. Henry	Journalist Author	VI–8–50	Naples	VI–11–50	Switzerland
Jarvis, Wm.	Consul Merchant	II–26–50	Naples	– – –	– – –
Jones, John Beauchamp	Journalist Author	III–2–48	Florence	– – –	– – –
Kirkland, C. M. S.	Writer	– – –	– – –	– – –	– – –
Lester, Charles Edwards	Consul	III–18–48	Leghorn	– – –	– – –
Lippincott Joshua Bellinger	Publisher	IX–29–50	Leghorn	– – –	– – –
Marsh, George P.	Diplomat	XII–30–49	Florence	I–17–50	Naples
*Martin, J. L.	Diplomat	VIII–3–48	Leghorn	– – –	– – –
Mayo, Wm. Kennon	Naval Officer	VIII–16–48	Leghorn	– – –	– – –
Minturn, Robert B.	Merchant	I–9–49	Florence	I–22–49	Malta
Mozier, Joseph	Sculptor	X–10–50	Florence	IX–15–50	Florence
Newberry, John Stoughton	Congressman	III–24–50	Naples	– – –	– – –
Parsons, Thomas Wm.	Poet Translator of Dante	– – –	– – –	III–16–48	Florence
Perkins, Charles Callahan	Art critic	IX–15–48	Marseilles	– – –	– – –

Name	Profession	Date of arrival in Rome	From City	Date of Departure from Rome	Destination
Portier, Michael	Catholic Bishop	- - -	- - -	VII-27-49	Marseilles
Prescott, Wm. Hickling	Historian	III-4-49	Naples	IV-13-49	Florence
Reynolds, Wm.	Naval Officer	I-9-49	Naples	V-4-48	Florence
Scott, Wm. Anderson	Presbyterian Clergyman	XII-18-50	Leghorn	- - -	- - -
Slaughter, Philip	Episcopal Clergyman	II-1-49	Naples	- - -	- - -
Spalding, Martin John	Catholic Bishop	- - -	- - -	XI-15-49	Leghorn
Squibb, Ed. Robinson	Physician Pharmacist	XI-25-50	Naples	XII-6-50	Florence
Thébaud, Aug. J.	Catholic priest, Educator	V-2-50	Naples	V-6-50	Florence
Treadwell, Daniel	Inventor Professor	- - -	Leghorn	III-16-48	Florence
Upjohn, Richard	Architect	IX-14-50	Leghorn	- - -	- - -
Wallace, Horace Binney	Literary and art critic	XII-18-50	Leghorn	- - -	- - -
Ware, Wm.	Protestant Minister	IX-29-48	Florence	- - -	- - -
Warren, John C.	Physician Surgeon	VI-26-50	Naples	- - -	- - -

HOWARD R. MARRARO

Columbia University

MISCELLANY

Some Student Letters of John Lancaster Spalding

It is now over twenty-seven years since the death of John Lancaster Spalding, first bishop of Peoria, and one of the most distinguished prelates ever to rule an American diocese. Unfortunately no biography of the man has yet been published. One may rightly say it is unfortunate, for the range of his activity was wide and the power of his influence decisive in many of the major movements which marked the period when the Church came of age in the United States. The writer's attention was first directed to Spalding as the founder of the Catholic University of America. That interest widened, as historical investigations usually do, to include his other activities. A search in a number of archives in the East and the Middle West yielded over 125 unpublished letters from or about Spalding through the half century from his student days in 1857 at Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, to the resignation from his diocese in 1908 following a breakdown of his health. It is the hope of the writer to publish an article in some future issue of the *Catholic Historical Review* on Spalding and the University. Meanwhile it was thought that the accompanying letters from his student days might be of interest to our readers as showing Spalding in his earlier years. The letters reveal a youth of deep seriousness and earnest zeal for all that affected the welfare of the Church. His judgments on the great political and social movements of the mid-nineteenth century are striking, though not always sound. At times Spalding displayed a naïveté which must have amused his wise old uncle, the archbishop of Baltimore, to whom many of the letters were addressed. Yet for a seminarian and young priest in his early twenties to concern himself with the great issues of his day, regardless of his faulty judgment, was an earnest of future development which Spalding did not fail to manifest.

John Lancaster Spalding was born at Lebanon, Kentucky, on June 2, 1840, as the oldest in a family of nine children. He was the son of Richard Madison Spalding and Mary Jane Lancaster, two families famous in the early Catholic life of Kentucky. His paternal great-grandfather, Benedict Spalding, had come out to the West in 1790 from St. Mary's County, Maryland, and was, therefore, one of the earliest Catholic pioneers among the large group of Maryland families who migrated to Kentucky in the last fifteen years of the eighteenth century.[1]

[1] For Kentucky Catholicism in these early years, cf. Sister Mary Ramona Mattingly, *The Catholic Church on the Kentucky Frontier, 1785-1812* (Washington, 1936), especially pp. 17-69.

Spalding first went to school at St. Mary's College, Marion County, which had been founded in 1821 by Father William Byrne. Although the institution had the name of a college, it was hardly more than a combined primary and secondary school, but it served to prepare Spalding for college and that almost within sight of his family home at Lebanon. The Lebanon school was in charge of a group of French Jesuits from 1831 to 1846 and was described by Peter Verhaegen, S.J., then rector of St. Joseph's College, Bardstown, in a letter to Father Benedict Spalding on December 5, 1849, as "a school for Catholic boys only, *un petit seminaire* for such as might have a mission to the ecclesiastical state."[2] During Spalding's time there St. Marys was under the direction of the diocesan clergy following the departure of the Jesuits in 1846.[3]

In the late summer of 1857 the seventeen-year-old lad left the family home at Lebanon to continue his education at Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, where he entered on August 22. For the first few months things went well for the new collegian and he wrote his mother on November 11:

> As to my education I think I might say that I am learning very fast. My mind is developing itself. And what before I saw confusedly are now becoming clear as the crystal light of day. I am studying hard. That is what I live on. Man's mental powers were not given to lie dormant and with God's grace if I have any, they shall be cultivated.[4]

About three weeks later on December 2 young Spalding wrote his mother again and relayed to her what must have been a piece of exciting news for students at the Mount that winter:

> Everything in College too is proceeding steadily without any interuption [*sic*]. Our President is now in the East *begging* I think for the new church which is now being built. A good many improvements are being made about College. There is a splendid stone building just finished which contains a dormitory, refectory and some private rooms. We will move into this at Christmas. Also the College will then for the first time be illumined with gas.[5]

[2] Quoted in Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., *The Jesuits of the Middle United States* (New York, 1938), III, 305.

[3] Edmund J. Goebel, *A Study of Catholic Secondary Education during the Colonial Period up to the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1852* (Washington, 1936), pp. 75-76.

[4] John Lancaster Spalding to his Mother, Emmitsburg, November 11, 1857, photostat from the Archives of the University of Notre Dame. Hereafter these Archives will be referred to as AUND.

[5] John Lancaster Spalding to his Mother, Emmitsburg, December 2, 1857, photostat, AUND. McCaffrey Hall was opened for occupancy at the Emmits-

In the same letter Spalding makes a familiar plea for permission to go west for Christmas. Apparently his family had suggested his spending the holidays with some of his mother's relatives in St. Mary's County, for he wrote:

> I have enquired about the Lancasters of St. Mary's County, and am told that the name of the old man is Charles Lancaster and his postoffice is Newport St. Marys County. But I don't think it would exactly suit for me to spend my vacations down there. The connection is to [*sic*] remote (if there is any at all) to render it proper that I should go there without knowing any of them. As to where I shall spend my vacation I will leave that entirely to Father and yourself. I think, if you conclude to send me here another year, it will be better to spend it either at home or at College, just as you may choose. My expenses home and back again will be $15 dollars [*sic*] more than they would be were I to remain here. Christmas will soon be here and *this* will be the *first* one of *my life* spent away from home. *Home* what a charm has even the very word![6]

He informed his mother that there were busy days ahead "since I am one of the speakers upon St. John's day, one of the greatest collegiate festivals since the sir name of both the Pres. and Vice Pres. is John. On this account you must excuse me if my letters are not four pages long."[7]

Spalding, of course, did not know at the time that this would be his last Christmas in Emmitsburg and that he would have no further worries on the score of spending that merry season in the secluded village of northwestern Maryland. It happened that four days after the students moved into the new building there took place a rebellion against the authority of the faculty in which Spalding was involved. Just what was the nature of this outbreak is not clear. The historians of the College refer to it simply as: "...some disturbance at the College following an investigation into the contents of the boys' boxes, and several boys were expelled."[8] In alluding to these student troubles the same writers mitigate the guilt of the culprits by remarking the lack of athletic sports and proper gymnasium facilities, and they add:

burg school on January 11, 1858, just a week previous to Spalding's departure. Mary M. Meline and Edward F. X. McSweeny, *The Story of the Mountain* (Emmitsburg, 1911), I, 527-528.

[6] John Lancaster Spalding to his Mother, Emmitsburg, December 2, 1857, photostat AUND.

[7] *Ibid.* John McCaffrey became the seventh president of the Emmitsburg institution in March, 1838, and served until April, 1872; John McCloskey became vice-president in February, 1842, and succeeded McCaffrey as the eighth president of the College in November, 1872.

[8] Meline-McSweeny, *op. cit.*, I, 528.

> Social conditions in the south particularly also account for a good deal of it, for the sons of planters were not accustomed to such severe discipline, and in fine, the spirit of independence was even more rampant than it is today amongst American youths, for they were nearer the Revolution.[9]

At any rate, Spalding was one of the students expelled and he left Emmitsburg on January 18, 1858. In his later years he did not hold any grudge against the College because of this incident, as we shall have reason to show in a later article.

There is no record of Spalding's having been in school during the last half of that academic year. Most likely he was permitted to cool his heels in Lebanon awaiting his parents' permission for him to enter Mount Saint Mary's College of the West in Cincinnati, where he appeared on September 1, 1858. The seminary of that name had been opened in October, 1851, but it was soon realized that a college conducted in close proximity to the seminary would provide the best means for developing future seminarians. Especially was this desire felt after St. Xavier College, founded in 1840 by the Jesuits in down-town Cincinnati, had not yielded the anticipated number of vocations for the diocesan clergy and, too, after the failure of St. Peter's College, Chillicothe, Ohio, an institution founded in 1855 for this purpose. St. Peter's closed after only a few months of operation. Accordingly plans were advanced by Archbishop Purcell and on September 15, 1856, Mount Saint Mary's College of the West opened its doors. The institution was, therefore, just two years old when Spalding came to Cincinnati and he found many points of similarity between this college and the one he had left at Emmitsburg the previous January. The historians of the Cincinnatin institution state:

> Most of the professors were graduates of the College at Emmitsburg, and the course of studies, discipline and rules, introduced by the sainted founders of that distinguished school were adopted, with such improvements as the times required, by Mount St. Mary's of the West.[10]

The College opened on August 24 of the year Spalding became a student there and on September 15 there was celebrated the second anniversary. At the simple celebration Spalding was chosen to give the address for the students, demonstrating that the incident in Emmitsburg had not darkened his reputation in Cincinnati and indicating, too, that he enjoyed early distinction as a public speaker. One of the memorable events of his stay in Cincinnati was his attendance at the silver jubilee of the episcopacy of Archbishop Purcell on October 13, 1858. Spalding was one of a class of

[9] *Ibid.*, I, 529.

[10] Michael J. Kelly and James M. Kirwin, *History of Mt. St. Mary's Seminary of the West, Cincinnati, Ohio* (Cincinnati, 1894), p. 90.

six young men to receive the A.B. degree at the commencement on June 30, 1859, when he was the valedictorian and gave an oration on the "Spirit of English Literature." At a faculty meeting held on June 25 he had been awarded the rhetorical honor for the year just closing.[11] During his time in Cincinnati the president of the College was Sylvester H. Rosecrans, who in March, 1868, became the first bishop of the newly-erected see of Columbus. On the occasion of Bishop Spalding's own consecration in New York on May 1, 1877, Rosecrans was the preacher.

Following Spalding's graduation from college he made plans for taking his theological training in Europe. As a candidate for the Diocese of Louisville he had the personal guidance of his uncle, Martin J. Spalding, his father's brother, who was the bishop of the diocese. Bishop Spalding had been himself a student at the Urban College of the Propaganda in Rome, but just two years before young Spalding's graduation in Cincinnati there had opened in March, 1857, the American College at Louvain. That institution owed its birth in large measure to two American bishops, Peter P. Lefevere, coadjutor bishop of Detroit, and Martin J. Spalding of Louisville. It was natural, therefore, that the latter should direct his nephew to the new foundation at Louvain. He arrived in Louvain late in 1859, the last student to enter the house that year. Fifteen students composed the student body at the opening of that academic year.[12] From the fall of 1859 until July, 1864, except for short holidays, Spalding was in residence at the American College studying undergraduate theology as well as taking courses in the University of Louvain. He came to have a deep love for the school and remained throughout his life an active alumnus. The historian of the College reflected that interest when he wrote: "If ever an alumnus merited well of the College, it was he."[13]

Spalding wrote the words for the song of the American College at Louvain, the music being composed by another candidate for the Diocese of Louisville, Alphonse M. Coenen. On July 7, 1862, he took the S.T.B. degree at the University of Louvain, two of his classmates being Gustave Limpens who was studying for the Diocese of Detroit, and Henry Gabriels who was to become in September, 1891, the second bishop of Ogdensburg, New York.[14] Spalding was ordained to the priesthood by Cardinal Sterckx at Mechlin on December 19, 1863. The remainder of that academic year was spent in finishing his work for the S.T.L. degree at the University

[11] Minutes of Faculty Meetings, Record Book, Archives of Mt. St. Mary's Seminary of the West.

[12] J. Van der Heyden, *The Louvain American College* (Louvain, 1909), p. 58.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[14] *Annuaire de l'Université catholique de Louvain, 1863*, (Louvain, 1863), p. 155.

which he took on July 11, 1864.[15] On this latter date the future Bishop Gabriels took the same degree and Patrick W. Riordan of the Diocese of Chicago was admitted to the S.T.B. degree. In July, 1883, Riordan, who became a close friend of Spalding's, was made coadjutor to Archbishop Alemany of San Francisco and succeeded as second archbishop there in December, 1884, upon the resignation of Alemany. Since Spalding was only a little over twenty-three years of age upon finishing his university course at Louvain, he suggested to his uncle that he spend the next year or so in Rome where he could acquire the doctor's degree and Archbishop Spalding approved. It would seem from the tone of his letters that the young priest did not receive the instructions to proceed to Rome with much enthusiasm, and the historian of the Louvain school mentions that "when ordered to Rome for the Doctor's degree [Spalding] said that he preferred the Louvain, S.T.L. to the Roman D.D."[16] He had come to feel at home in his surroundings and he was reluctant to depart. In a letter to his father and mother two years before he had spoken of his affection for the country when he wrote: "Our vacations commence tomorrow. I think I will remain in Belgium. I can amuse myself better here than in another country, for the Belgians are the finest people in the word."[17] Spalding valued the university connections at Louvain very highly and when many years later the rector of the American College wrote the alumni a circular letter in view of the approaching silver jubilee of the school to be celebrated in March, 1882, Spalding, then bishop of Peoria, replied to De Nève:

> I am especially glad to see from your letter that the better sort of students will be permitted to follow the university course. This is undoubtedly very important, and was, as you know, a chief reason for founding the College at Louvain.[18]

Spalding left Louvain, therefore, in July, 1864, for further study in Rome. He followed lectures in the University of Rome or the Sapienza and took the degree of D.D. before his departure for America in the spring of 1865.

With the exception of the final letter, all those which follow are from the period of Spalding's foreign study. The last letter from Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore was written to his nephew shortly after the latter's

[15] *Ibid.*, (1865), p. 192. In both cases the *Annuaire* speaks of Spalding as a priest of the Diocese of St. Louis.

[16] Van der Heyden, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

[17] John Lancaster Spalding to his Father and Mother, Louvain, August 12, 1862, photostat, AUND.

[18] John Lancaster Spalding to John De Nève, rector, American College, Louvain, reprinted in Van der Heyden, *op. cit.*, pp. 173-174.

return to Louisville from Rome and before it had been definitely decided that he should remain in that diocese rather than go to Baltimore. The handwriting of Spalding offers no special difficulty in the letters, but the spelling, punctuation, and paragraphing are frequently faulty. He was conscious, as he mentioned in one of his letters, that he was a poor speller. In editing the text persistent misspellings have been corrected, e. g., 'evry' for 'every', 'beleive' for 'believe', 'and 'untill' for 'until'. Both Spalding and his uncle, the archbishop, frequently spelled 'nephew' as 'newphew'. With these exceptions the spellings have been left as in the originals. A few minor marks of punctuation have been inserted to clarify the meaning and new paragraphs have been introduced to break up what were sometimes lengthy letters containing a variety of subjects but having no paragraphs at all. In supplying the notes which accompany the letters, identifications have been furnished of only those persons and events that were of importance in the history of the Church either in the United States or in Europe. Thus a number of the lesser names have been passed over without identification.

The writer wishes to express his thanks to the Right Reverend Joseph M. Nelligan, chancellor of the Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington and custodian of the splendid collection of documents on the history of the American Church in the Baltimore Cathedral Archives, for his singular courtesy while working in that depository. His gratitude is likewise due to the Reverend Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., archivist of the University of Notre Dame, for furnishing photostats of the Spalding materials in the Notre Dame collection. Finally he would be grateful to those who possesses material on John Lancaster Spalding if they would inform him of such so that at sometime in the not-too-distant future a critical biography of the great American bishop may be written.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America

American College, Louvain [19]
April 2, 1861

To Right Reverend Martin J. Spalding
Bishop of Louisville

Dear Uncle.

We are now in the Easter vacations. I am remaining at College. I had several oportunities [*sic*] to go out to spend my vacation but I preferred to remain here at home. There are five or six of us here. We spend the time very agreeably. Sometimes we visit some old curé for a day. At

[19] Baltimore Cathedral Archives, 37A-1. These Archives will hereafter be referred to as: BCA.

other times we amuse ourselves walking through the country listening at the larks singing the praises of God. Then we visit an American who is sick. Now however he is getting well. For the rest of the time we perform our spiritual exercises and study a little. My health is very good and I am content. I could not ask God for anything more in this world; except that I might serve Him better. I do not hear from home so often now, but the same God watches over them as me: and so it is well. I have just written a letter to brother Richard telling him that I expect him here next year. It is certain that if we try we can have American priests enough for our diocese and if our priests seeking only the glory of God and seeking that earnestly, trained rightly the hearts and minds of our boys, we would immediately have students enough and good ones. It would be impious to say that God does not give us vocations. One zealous man full of holy Enthusiasm seeking nothing but the glory of God and loving nothing else but that glory could have a noble, pious and powerful army of priests in our diocese in less than ten years; not he but the grace of God with him. St. Jerome says "one man can reform a whole nation" and one man can convert a whole nation. History gives us a thousand such examples. I do not believe that this is the foolish enthusiasm of a boy who takes his dreams for realities. St. Ignatius with the grace of God saved Christianity and planted the faith even to the farthest ends of the earth. St. Francis Sales converted 72,000 of the most obstinate heretics; St. Charles Boromeo [*sic*] reformed the clergy of the whole world by reforming his own. No, enthusiasm can never be foolish or extravigant [*sic*] so long as it seek the greater glory of God and trusts in His power, not in its own meekness. Christ Jesus hath said "*credenti omnia possibilia sunt*" and the history of Christianity has confirmed its truth. I do not judge any living man; but I can not believe that we do as much as we could for the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls. The same God is with us Who conquered nations for the Apostles and the great missionaries. Deeds, not words convert the hearts of men. Mr. Russell [20] and Mr. Wiseman [21] go now. I expect much from them. May God bless their labours.

[20] David Russell (1830-1900) was in 1858 the first native American student to enter the American College at Louvain; he was ordained at Louvain on December 22, 1860 and returned from parochial work in the Diocese of Louisville to the College to serve as vice rector and professor of English during the year 1865-1866. It was Russell's manuscript notes in the archives of the College which provided much of the material for the early chapters of J. Van der Heyden's *The Louvain American College, 1857-1907* (Louvain, 1909).

The three brothers of Spalding whom he mentions by name in these letters were: Richard C. who was ordained a priest but lost his life on June 15, 1861, a few days after his ordination while swimming in the Ohio River at Cincinnati; Leonard H. who practiced medicine for a time at Springfield, Kentucky,

Human learning is good to obtain respect for our religion in the eyes of the world; but the souls it has converted oh! how few they are! Our religion is supernatural and only those actions which proceed from supernatural motives are efficient for the good of religion.

That is all very well; but there is a difference between talking and acting. I only reply "credenti omnia sunt possibilia" and to him who believes and trusts in God that common place saying, good for weak irresolute men, is simply absurd. I hope all my brothers with the grace of God will be priests and I hope we will soon have enough priests and good ones; but if not may the holy will of God be done. There will come a day when all things will be right and every creature will acknowledge the omnipotent goodness of God and He *alone* will be praised from eternity to eternity.

My Dear Uncle pray for me that I be meek and humble; little in my own eyes. I do pray for you, for I know you have many difficulties; more than I can imagine but God will be with you et "apud Deum non erit impossibile omne verbum." Give my love to Uncle Ben [22] and all the priests, especially to Father O'Brien [23] and Father Lavialle.[24]

I remain your devoted nephew.

J. L. SPALDING

P.S.

I have the "Revue catholique de Louvain" from the year 46 to 59 I think. One or two of the years are not complete. If it could be of any use to you I will send it by father Russell. You can tell me in your next letter.

J. L. S.

later moving to Peoria, Illinois, and who died on August 20, 1914; Martin J., the youngest of the family who died on August 18, 1864, three months before his eighth birthday.

[21] William J. Wiseman entered the College from Cork in October, 1857; he was the first Irish student of the College, the first student ordained, and the first student of the institution to take a degree at the University of Louvain where he earned the S.T.B. in 1859; he was ordained for the Diocese of Louisville in 1860 and later was transferred to the Diocese of Newark; he founded *The Pastor*, a periodical for priests in the United States.

[22] Benedict J. Spalding (1812-1868), brother of Archbishop Martin J. Spalding, was rector of the cathedral in Louisville, 1845-1848, and twice administrator of the Diocese of Louisville.

[23] Presumably Matthew A. O'Brien, O.P. (1804-1871), missionary in Kentucky and provincial of the American Dominican province, 1850-1854.

[24] Peter J. Lavialle (1819-1867), president of St. Mary's College, Marion County, Kentucky, 1856-1865, the first school attended by Spalding. Lavialle was appointed bishop of Louisville on July 7, 1865, and died on May 11, 1867.

Louvain, Dec. 6th. 1862 [25]

To Reverend David Russell
Diocese of Louisville

Dear Father Russell—

I received in due time your kind and most interesting letter. I would have answered it long ago, but a few days after I received [it] Judge Vermilighen came to Louvain and had his portrait taken and requested me to send one to you. I have been waiting for it, but it is not yet ready or rather did not succeed very well so I will send it you in my next letter. I went to see Mr Vermilighen in the vacations and they are all very sorry that you did not come to see them before leaving. If ever you imprint the likeness of your countenance on paper or steel you must not fail to send it to them or me and I will give it to them. I promised them you would do it. We have or will have thirty four students this year. Many new Germans. I am proff. of the profound course of English but only give class twice a week. Mr Limpens gives a class of Rubrics on Saturday. Yankee and Father Denaree between them teach the elementary course of English. Reusem and Moulaert are proff. of the Schola brevis. Vandermoeren has gone to Rome and will not become dr this year. Poor Mr. Vandenbroek died on the feast of the Assumption after a short sickness. Mr. LeDoux of Liege, Dr. of Rome, is his successor. The four Oregon men, VanSaurne, Mr. Debringcken are all in America before this time. Father Debringcken is in the diocese of Hartford. Mr. Fierens has written an Indian Dictionary containing a few hundred words. Mr. Friedland is much liked where he is.

[25] BCA, 37A-2. Accurate information was not available on all the priests mentioned in this letter. The following men, in the order in which Spalding names them, were the most prominent. Gustave Limpens, ordained in 1863 at Louvain for the Diocese of Detroit; wrote the words of the College hymn; died at Grand Rapids, Michigan, on January 25, 1881. John F. Fierens entered American Colege, Louvain, in 1859, ordained for Oregon City in 1860 and died as vicar general of that archdiocese in 1893. Frederick Friedland entered Louvain in 1858; was ordained for the Diocese of Detroit in 1861, and died in 1896. Paul H. Mans entered Louvain with Spalding in 1859; ordained for Diocese of Nesqually in 1863, later became a Jesuit on the Pacific Coast and died in 1890. Charles J. Seghers (1839-1886) ordained at Mechlin on May 31, 1863, for the Diocese of Vancouver Island; appointed bishop of Vancouver Island on March 11, 1873, and coadjutor of Oregon City on July 18, 1878; succeeded as archbishop of Oregon City on December 12, 1880, translated to Diocese of Vancouver Island on March 7, 1884; murdered at Yessetlatoh, Alaska on November 28, 1886. Alphonse M. Coenen ordained for the Diocese of Louisville in 1861 after three years in American College, Louvain; composed the music for the College song, the words of which were written by Spalding; pastor of Earlington, Kentucky, from 1875 to his death on February 13, 1905.

Yankee is my companion in the place of Mr Mans. I went to Aix la Chapelle with T. [or F.?] Deneue during vacations to attend the meeting of the Catholic Union. We saw many of the great men of Germany. I met there a priest who had been professor in Mt St Mary's. His name was Wepeller of the family of the celebrated Jesuit historian. There will be ordination at Christmas. I do not know whether I will be ordained deacon or not. I will be two or three days too young to become priest at Pentecost. Eight rooms have been made in the old dormitory. The third story is full of rooms except the dormitory which is immediately above the old one. Mr Seghers deacon of Ghent is music teacher. Tell Mr Coenen that Mr Deryckere will not send the music until it will all be ready. Mr Debolle, a priest who is studying to become proff. in the Seminary of Cin. has your room. Weregge has the room of Mr Vermerst. Waltenspiel and Eggermont will be ordained deacons at Christmas.

Thus far we have had a very nice winter relatively. The Bishops of Buffalo, Brooklyn, Hartford, Chicago, Boston and the Archbishop of New Orleans [26] have been to see us this summer. The Archbishop told me to send his compliments to my Uncle. He is a most admirable man. I think he has some twenty or thirty subjects who return with him to New Orleans. He told me that Uncle Ben was not a rebel neither am I although the South is the land of my heart. I have seen the anecdote of Morgan and the Abbot of the Trappists. Is it true? I suppose the son of Prentice who was killed is the same who was in Louvain. Bishop Rosecrans [27] wrote me that Bill Manly was a cavalry officer in the rebel army. You have a difficult place I know 't, but I know also that you believe in Jesus Christ our Lord and Master and that you can do all things in him who strengthens you. Fear not but fight to the death and the victory will be ours. I have been reading the history of Gregory VII and it gives me new faith in the power and strength of him who believes in Jesus Christ whose name be blest forever.

Farewell. Pray for me.

Your friend J. L. Spalding

[26] The bishops of whom Spalding speaks as visiting the College in the summer of 1862 were: John Timon, C.M., (1797-1867), first bishop of Buffalo; John Loughlin (1817-1891), first bishop of Brooklyn; Francis P. MacFarland (1819-1874), third bishop of Hartford; James Duggan (1825-1899), fourth bishop of Chicago; and Jean Marie Odin, C.M., (1801-1870), second archbishop of New Orleans.

[27] Sylvester H. Rosecrans (1827-1878) was president of Mount Saint Mary's College of the West, Cincinnati, 1856-1861, during Spalding's year there. He was made auxiliary bishop of Cincinnati on December 23, 1861, and promoted to the new Diocese of Columbus on March 3, 1868; he died on October 21, 1878.

P.S.

My love to the Bishop, Uncle Ben and all my acquaintances. Father Denève [28] has received your letters, also those of Mr Coenens and he thanks you. he intens [*sic*] to write soon but because the letter is already heavy enough he can add nothing this time.

J. L. S.

Am. Coll. Louvain. Jan. 1st. 1863 [29]

To Right Reverend Martin J. Spalding
Bishop of Louisville

My Dear Uncle.

As it is some time since I wrote to you and also a considerable while since I received a letter from you perhaps it would not be amiss to re-establish a line of communication. So I begin this first day of 1863 by wishing you a happy new year. I do not consider it at all unlikely that the present year be one of joy and blessing for you for I think that with St. Paul and every true priest of the Lord Jesus, you can truly say "in omni tribulatione superabundo gaudio." Certainly it is most probable that you will have tribulations and afflictions in abundance; for whatever afflicts your country and your people afflicts you also. Yet it is also certain that to the priest of God afflictions are what the battle is to the fiery steed, they augment his strength and mettle. I was just on the point of entering upon an elaborate warlike comparison but I desist, for I think that battles and battlesteeds wars and warriors are too real and commonplace in America to be any longer poetical. However to me war has always the mystery and the charm of poetry for I consider it as a divine conclusion as yet unknown; and this uncertainty excites within me a sentiment of longing, a hope and this is always poetical, for that alone is poetry which awakens the sentiment of the Beautiful, the longing after it and the firm undying hope of once arriving at its full possession. You would almost say I am German, I am so mysteriously and deeply philosophical. I am like many others who carried away by the charm of saying something nice, do not say what they wish to say and what they should say.

[28] John DeNève, second rector of the American College Louvain is mentioned frequently by Spalding in his letters. DeNève was pastor of Niles, Michigan, at the time of his appointment to the rectorship in 1859. He had been in America three years as a priest of the Diocese of Detroit. He began his first administration of the College in January, 1860, and served until 1871; after a lapse of a decade he was again rector during the years 1881-1891. DeNève was rector during all but a month or two of Spalding's entire time at Louvain.

[29] BCA, 37A-3.

Great assuredly are the miseries and sufferings of our country and her children. Yet in this very suffering I find a motive of consolation. For suffering when borne with a right mind brings a twofold blessing; it purifies and ennobles. The world is filled with crimes, but because it is filled with lamentations and cries with misery and woe, it becomes like unto the Lord Jesus Who has mercy upon it and it is purified. Suffering enobles, it gives the boy the virility of youth, and the youth the maturity of manhood; and to man if it be great it gives the streenth [*sic*] and power of the hero or the saint. Socrates was greater in death than in life, and Cesar had risen too high not to rise still higher by falling by a great misfortune. In a word there is a secret mysterious power in suffering which is the source of all that is great and noble. Do you think the Spouse of Christ would have ever become so fair so great so divinely beautiful, had she not seen her children in every age and clime pouring out their lifeblood that the Mother might be made great by the sufferings and sorrows of her children. It is not I who say all this but Donoso Cortes[30] the greatest statesman that has lived in this century. But why this dispute about originality? It was God that gave it to him and to me through him. All comes from God. What difference is it whether mediately or immediately.

I am a dreamer and there is nothing practical in me. This is equivalent to absolute nullity with every one who thinks and acts like an AngloSaxon. The only reality for an Anglosaxon is the reality of interest and interest itself would be unreal unless embodied in gold and beef.

I do not like to speak of myself but since I have begun I will finish. I am excentric [*sic*] and become more so every day. I change with the wind and the weather and the time of the day. And who could say how often the wind and the weather change within the space of 24 hours in Belgium? Now clear, now cloudy, now calm and now windy now warm now cold. And then that heavy moist atmosphere that sinking through the pores of my body weighs like an incubus upon my soul. I am like a nervous music box and the wind the sunshine and the rain play upon me. Now joyous now sad now full of life and now half dead.

I have the rhumatism and it is by this that I am turned to a harsh, a sweet, a joyous or a melancholy strain.

Had I written this letter yesterday probably it would not contain a word of what is in it now and were I to write it tomorrow more than likely it would be entirely different from the one of yesterday. I am a man of circumstance ruled by the whim and the fit of the moment. I do not know

[30] Juan Francisco Donoso Cortés (1809-1853) held posts as cabinet minister and ambassador in the government of Queen Mother Maria Cristina of Spain. He was a rationalist in his early years but later repudiated that philosophy and became an ardent champion of the Church; he was a close friend of Louis Veuillot.

what you will think of my letter, but I know that it is an image of myself, a child of its father. And yet I am not as bad as I say I am precisely because I am what I say I am. I think I hear you exclaim, behold! what philosophy is worth! he who but a moment ago was reasoning so charmingly about the beauty and delightfulness of suffering; is now repining because the wind and the rain jerk a little harshly on his nerves. No. I do not repime, I ask nothing. I say now as I have ever said. I am happy and hope ever to be so in this world. But it is often a melancholy happiness for there is a sweet melancholy as there is a bitter joy. I can understand the invocation of Milton "Come Thou Godess sage and holy, Come divinest Melancholy." And who does not know that the sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thoughts? Autumn with its falling leaves has more music to my soul than spring with its living roses.

I stop my tune in order to take up that of other men. The Bishop of Boston [31] was here a few weeks ago. He sends his compliments to you and Uncle Ben. Father Stonestreet [32] of Georgetown College paid us a visit the other day. He also sends you his compliments. He told us much news about the war and of the good that was being done by the Sisters of Charity among the soldiers. Last year I only received one letter from home I think. I do not write any more because it is useless I suppose. If the opportunity presents itself give them all my best love. Since I read no more English authors I forget the good old AngloSaxon tongue. I write it badly and spell it worse, but I have taken a firm resolve to learn better if God gives me strength. Give my love to Uncle Ben and also to Uncle Mat. Lancaster,[33] for although I scarcely know him yet he is my uncle and a priest and therefore I love him. I remain your affectionate and obedient nephew.

J. L. SPALDING

Louvain. Jan. 26th/63 [34]

To Right Reverend Martin J. Spalding
Bishop of Louisville

[31] John B. Fitzpatrick (1812-1866), third bishop of Boston.

[32] Charles H. Stonestreet, S.J. (1813-1885), twenty-third president of Georgetown College, 1851-1852, provincial of the Maryland province, 1853-1858, and procurator to Rome.

[33] James M. Lancaster (1810-1869), brother of Spalding's mother, died as administrator of the Diocese of Covington following the vacancy caused by the death of Bishop George A. Carrell, S.J., on September 25, 1868.

[34] BCA, 37A-4.

My Dear Uncle.

As F. Deneve is writing to you I will also add a few words in order to thank you for the most gravious new year gift which [you] have been so kind as to send me. I thank you also for your photograph which I think resembles you very much. I will certainly never be sufficiently grateful for all the kindness which you have ever shown me; but I think that all you ask of me is that I love you and pray for you and be obedient to you. To do this is the desire of my heart and my firm intention. I am very glad that you are about to send us two new students. We will receive them as brothers and they will immediately be at home. I wrote to yourself and F. Russell about three weeks ago. I hope you received the letter for I sent a "Photograph" in it to F. Russell.

I received the photographs of Father and Mother. When you see them thank them fore [*sic*] me and give my love to them and to all my brothers and sisters; to Uncle Ben, Father Russell and all my acquaintances.

I remain your affectionate nephew

L. J. SPALDING

Louvain, May 3d 1864 [35]

Dear Father and Mother.

You letters arrived at an interval of only one or two days. I am always glad to receive news from America and it is more especially welcome when it comes from home, from those whom I love with an undying affection. I would have answered your letters immediately, but my examinations were just at hand and I remembered that you yourselves had always at least practically taught me this fundamental maxim: business before pleasure. I have already passed two examinations, yesterday and today, next week I will still have to undergo a public trial of what I know, but I am so fatigued that I do not feel like studying to day so I have concluded to write to my dear Father and Mother.

I received a letter from Len not long ago stating to my great joy that he had entirely recovered. About a month ago I received also a letter from Uncle Martin in which he approved of the plan which I had suggested to him as to how I am to pass the coming scholastic year. I will leave Louvain about the middle of July for Germany where I will remain three or four months. Thence I will pass over into Italy and go down to Rome where I will stay until next summer. I will not be able to give you my address in Germany so you may continue to direct your letters here to the college whence they will be sent to me there.

[35] Photostat, AUND.

I was of course glad to hear that Uncle Martin had been appointed to the Archbishopric of Baltimore[36] because I hope and believe that it will be for the greater honor and glory of God. I suppose his successor in Ky will soon be known. Whoever he may be, for us at least, he will not be Uncle Martin, but though we lose I hope others will gain and we should have charity for all men.

Mother's letter arrived only on the 26th of April consequently just two days too late for the anniversary of grandfather Lancaster but I will nevertheless say a mass for him and also another on the anniversary of grandmother L. I pray every day in the mass for all my relatives and friends both living and dead.

I will see if Mother keeps her promise about my receiving a letter every month, but even though she should not hold it I thank her nevertheless for having made it for it shows at least a good will.

Give my best love to all my brothers and sisters, relations and friends also to the servants. My health is very good. Believe me dear Father and Mother. Your ever affectionate son.

J. L. SPALDING

Freiburg. Baden. July 24th. 1864[37]

Dear Father and Mother.

It is now nearly two weeks since I left Louvain. I started immediately after receiving the degree of Licentiate. I sent you my *theses* which I suppose you have already received. I am now settled down for a month or two in Freiburg, a beautiful little city of about 17,000 inhabitants situated three or four leagues from the Rhine. It is surrounded by mountains covered with vineyards, except on one side where stretches out a delightful valley through which flows a little river that empties into the Rhine. I have never seen a nicer cleaner town. There are rivulets of most limpid water flowing through nearly all the streets. In the center of the town is situated one of the finest gothic Cathedrals in the world. I wish you could assist at solemn high mass in one of these old gothic churches of Germany and hear the religious manly music of the Germans. I have never heard any thing that had such power to move the soul, to speak of Heaven, of God. There is also a celebrated university here—which is the principal reason why I came to this part of Germany. There are several professors here who have an European reputation, among others

[36] Martin J. Spalding was appointed archbishop of Baltimore on April 3, 1864.

[37] Photostat, AUND.

Alzog [38] and Stolz.[39] I am already acquainted with them. They are very kind and as are all really learned men without pretentions or pedantry. The lectures are all given in German; this suits me very well for it affords me a better oportunity [*sic*] of acquiring a more perfect knowledge of this language. After leaving here which will probably be towards the end of August I will go either to Switzerland or to Munich, as yet I am undecided as to which of these two I will choose. Here in Southern Germany one can live well and with little money. I have taken a room with a private family. The room is large, well furnished with sofa, cushioned chairs etc. For this I pay about four dollars a month. Here I also take breakfast. For dinner and supper I go to a kind of hotel. In all I do not spend half a dollar a day, and yet live better according to my taste than I could for $2 in the U. S. I can have pure wine for ten cents a bottle.

There are some of the strangest costumes here in the world. The peasant women of the " Black Forest " come to church with *beaver hats* of about a foot and a half in height. They are yellow and I think made of pasteboard, but for the rest are beavers except they are a little higher. Their hair is platted into one string which floats down the back. Others have something on the head which looks like two black horns. I give this as a specimen. If I wished to tell all I would have to write a book. The people are kind and warmhearted. I met an Englishman here who says he is acquainted with some of the Lancasters of Philadelphia. I do not know if those Lancasters be relations of ours. They are catholics he says. One of them married an englisman [*sic*] and died in England. Received a letter from Louvain the other day in which they told me that Uncle Martin is to be installed the 15th of Aug. and that Uncle Ben is administrator of Louisville.

I hear scarcely any thing about the war down here. The Germans are not a people for news. So long as they can sit down quietly with pipe and glass of bier [*sic*] they do not trouble themselves about what other people are doing. I never hear them speak even of their own war with Denmark. I received a letter from Len before I left Louvain. He says he is entirely well again. I am also very well. I would add another letter for Kate, but I am afraid it would make the packet too heavy so that you would have to pay double. I will write to her before long. Give her my best love and tell her I thank her for her kind letter.

The next time I write I hope I will be able to say more. I might tell you many things that I have seen and heard but you are too much occupied

[38] Johann Baptist Alzog (1808-1878), distinguished church historian who, after filling various academic posts, was appointed in 1853 to the chair of church history in the University of Freiburg.

[39] Alban Isidor Stolz (1808-1883), long associated as student, professor of theology, and during the war, 1859-1860, as rector of the University of Freiburg.

with the war and the situation of the country to take pleasure in the narration of sightseeings and journeyings. It will not be long I hope, my dear Father and Mother, before I will be able to speak to you by word of mouth and then I will tell you all I have seen and heard.
Give my best love to all my brothers and sisters, friends and relations.
Believe me dear Father and Mother.
Your ever devoted son.

J. L. SPALDING.

Venice Sept. 19th, 1864 [40]

To Most Reverend Martin J. Spalding
Archbishop of Baltimore

Dear Uncle.

I received yesterday your letter of the 15th of Aug. I do not think I wrote to you from Germany. I had heard that you were going to Baltimore and I thought I would wait until you would be settled down in your new home. I remained in Germany only about five weeks and then passed through Switzerland into Italy over the Splügen. I passed the greater part of the time at Freiburg where I heard the lectures of the professors of the University during three weeks. I made the acquaintance of Alzog and Stolz who were very kind to me. I think I have passed my time well and learned a great deal that will be useful to me. I like the Germans. I have always found them kind and hospitable especially the priests. They are not at all aristocratic but are essentially men of the people more so probably than the priests of any other nation. The German clergy has made great progress within the last few years. The episcopal body stands high morally and scientifically and is introducing as fast as possible the disciplinary ordinations of the Council of Trent regarding the education and life of priests. On the Rhein and in Westphalia the German clergy is as good I think as that of any other nation. In Baden there is an immense [next word illegible] since twenty years. About that time two professors of the University of Freiburg apostatised and Josephism was still alive to a certain extent among the clergy. This has all disappeared, thanks no doubt in a great degree to the zeal and courage of the Venerable Archbishop of Freiburg,[41] who is still active and full of vigor although he be ninety two years old.

Prof Stolz told me that some twenty or thirty years ago the general feeling among Catholics there was that the pope was to them a person

[40] BCA, 37A-5.

[41] Hermann von Vicari (1773-1868), archbishop of Freiburg during the years 1842-1868; he had a severe struggle with the government of the Grand Duchy of Baden to eradicate the remnants of Josephinism in his archdiocese.

almost as foreign as the Grand Turc. But this has also changed and Baden now contributes largely to the support of the holy Father. There is in Germany as almost every where in Europe a certain class of people that is infidel; and this class is politically the most powerful there as everywhere. Even in Belgium those who believe do not rule. This class has most everywhere in its hands the money and intelligence of the age. The press in Europe is rationalistic. The Universities with a few exceptions are rationalistic. In Germany even in the Catholic Universities the lay professors have often no religion. The natural consequence of this is that the greater part of those who receive an university education do so at the expense of their religion and in Europe all who wish to become lawyers, doctors, notaries, apothecaries etc. must study at the University. This great apostasy from God and deification of the human mind is certainly the logical consequence of Protestant principles; in fact every heresy is protestant, protestation against God, protestation against his church. This protestation exists now to a certain extent in Europe as well among Catholics as among Protestants. But if we let these money makers and railroad builders, newspaper writers and leaders alone and go back to the human race, the people, things look different here in Europe. The people in Europe in catholic countries as far as my experience extends is catholic and loves its religion. I am told that in France even among the people infidelity has spread considerably. I have been in several protestant countries of Germany and there also I think the people believe. In northern Germany they say infidelity exists to a great extent among the lower class of protestants. I think it is false to say that Protestantism is dead. Scientifically it is certainly dead. But in the hearts of many it still lives and will live until some great and universal revolution take place here in Europe. The people must have a religion, it will never be philosophic or rationalistic. Now in many countries it has protestantism and it is nearly impossible for it in the actual circumstances to receive another religion, consequently it holds to Protestantism. In Europe the peasantry is conscious of its ignorance and does not reason as it does with us, consequently the Catholic missionary has no means of getting at protestants here. Individual conversions will take place but they do not change the general face of affairs. The state here in Europe is omnipotent even there where the socalled liberal constitutional governments exist. Now in Protestant countries the State protects Protestantism and this is the source of its life. Protestantism arose through political influence and still lives because upheld by political power. If Europe were politically revolutionised I think it would easily become catholic. The old hatred of the Pope has gradually died out and if an opportunity were given the great reconciliation might easily be brought about. But those who rule fear Rome and try to keep the Pope as far away as possible.

I suppose you are already tired of these speculations so I will try to change the subject. It would be useless to describe to you my journey and the sights I have seen for I think you have passed over nearly the same ground. I am now living under the Austrian government. I think Austria is the most truly catholic government that now exists. I hope Venice will remain Austrian until the apostate priests, petty lawyers and lowbred freemasons will have played out their game in Turin. I saw their work in Milan and know what they are. One is free enough here if he only attend to his business and let the government alone. All this cry and hurrah about nationality and freedom is only the work of some worthless men who wish to rise in the world and are too weak and ignorant to do so by honest means. And even if there were tyranny it is better to be tyrannised over by one man than by the vulgar crowd and the world must always bear one of these two yokes.

In practice men are about as free under one government as under another. One man may be a tyrant and so may the people. I attach little importance to this or that form of government. All depends on the men who exercise the power. There have been excesses committed under every form of government, greater and more revolutionary probably under popular than under any other.

I am already two weeks in Venice. I will leave I think in about eight days for Padua, Ferrara, Bologna, Florence and then Rome where I will arrive in the beginning of October. I have the permission to enter the Belgian College, so I think I will take advantage of it. The pension is 920 frs which is very high. But as I have made [many?] advantages there I suppose it will be better to disregard one or two hundred frs more. I am travelling now for more than two months and I have spent only about four hundred frs in all. I have nearly 2500 frs left, with which I hope I will be able to come through. As to my coming to Baltimore I am willing to do any thing that you desire me, dear Uncle. I will never be able to repay you for all you have done for me but I will try to do all that I can. Then I leave it entirely to you as to whether I am to go to Baltimore or to Louisville. It is not place or circumstance that can makes us happy. Happiness dwells within the soul which in itself can be heaven or a hell. For the rest I think I would be but a poor secretary, but as to this also I let you judge. You can direct your next letter to Rome. Pray for me my dear Uncle.

Your affectionate nephew.

J. L. SPALDING

Belgian College, Rome. Nov. 15th/64 [42]

To Most Reverend Martin J. Spalding
Archbishop of Baltimore

My dear Uncle.

I arrived in Rome in the beginning of Oct. but I thought it better not to write until the schools opened so that I might be better able to give you an account of my position and occupation here. I went to see the Rev. Dr. Smith [43] who told me that from a letter which you wrote him he thought your intention was that I should study Canon law. Consequently I have resolved to devote my time exclusively to that branch of sacred science. I have already seen a good deal of Canon Law at Louvain where it is undoubtedly better and more profoundly taught than here in Rome. So I will repeat privately what I have already studied. Besides this I heare [*sic*] two professors of the Sapienza. Moreover I will assist at the discussions of the Congregation of the Council of Trent and also from time to time treat some case presented to the Congregation for decision. I intend also to assist at the sessions of the different Academies here in Rome. Then I hope to pass my time usefully which is all that I desire.

I have spoken with Card. Barnabo.[44] He told me that the name of Uncle Ben was the first on the list of the persons presented for the Diocese of Louisville. He did not know however whether or not he would be appointed Bishop. I would not have gone to see Card Barnabo had Father DeNeve not given me some business to attend to on account of which I had to speak to him. I have been to the Am. Coll. several times. I spent

[42] BCA, 37A-6.

[43] Spalding mentions this man several times in his letters from Rome. An effort to identify him with certainty was not successful. It is possible that he was Bernard Smith, a convert from Anglicanism, who figured in Newman's life just before the latter's conversion. This Bernard Smith was resident in Rome in Spalding's time and corresponded with Manning in that year. Cf. Edmund S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning* (New York, 1896), II, 722-723. A Bernard Smith, O.S.B. was pro-rector of the North American College, Rome from December, 1859 to March, 1860. The historian of that institution refers to him as one who was "for many years Professor of Theology at the Propaganda. He was noted for his great learning; and he was held in high esteem by the English-speaking residents in the Holy City, to whom he was always a devoted guide and friend. He was afterwards made Abbot in his order, the Benedictines." Henry A. Brann, *History of the American College, Rome* (New York, 1910), p. 86.

[44] Alessandro Barnabò, secretary of the Congregation of Propaganda, 1848-1856, and prefect of the same Congregation, 1856-1874.

a week at the country home of the Coll. out at Frascati. Dr McCloskey [45] and all of them were very kind to me. During the year however I will not go to see them often because it takes time et [*sic*] with their system of camerata it is not very convenient. I have seen the Holy Father several times. He seems to be enjoying perfect health. I will have an audience this week I think. I have not yet been to see the Rector of the Irish College. I will go before long. Dr. McClosky told me that you had been dangerously sick but that you had almost entirely recovered again. I hope this letter will find you entirely well.

Mother wrote to me some time ago announcing the death of my little brother Martin. It is sad to loose [*sic*] those we love; but I hope and believe that God in his mercy has taken my little brother to Himself so soon ne malitia mutaret intellectum ejus [Wisdom, 4, 11]. His death is also a grace which our Father in Heaven confers upon us who are left behind for it makes us feel that we have not hear [*sic*] a lasting dwelling and consequently that we must seek one which is to come. Dying friends are pioneers on the road to heaven making the route easier for those who must come after them. I am more resigned to die now than I would be if my two brothers were still living and therefore I consider their deaths a grace which God has given me. I am however willing to live and to work until my time shall come. I am not discouraged but feel a greater desire to do something for the glory of God than I ever did. My brothers were born to die and I have reason to believe that they died well, consequently I do not see why I should be discouraged. Discouragement anyhow is good for nothing so that even if I did feel like being discouraged I see that there is nothing to be gained by it. The victory is mine if I only fight until the end and I believe that neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities nor powers nor things present nor things future will ever be able to seperate [*sic*] us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

The martyrs of Gorcem [46] [*sic*] and several others will be canonised at Pentecost. I think my health will be better here than in Belgium. I wrote to you from Venice telling you that I was willing to do whatever

[45] William G. McCloskey (1823-1909) was the first rector of the North American College in Rome from 1860 to 1868. He was appointed bishop of Louisville on March 3, 1868, and died there on September 17, 1909. The North American College had opened on December 7, 1859, with twelve students at just the time Spalding was reaching Louvain.

[46] The nineteen martyrs of Gorkum were put to death in that Netherlands town on July 9, 1572, beatified on November 14, 1675, and canonized on June 29, 1865.

you might think best as to the diocese to which I am to be sent. I supposed you received the letter.

Pray for me my dear Uncle.

address Collegio Belgico via del Quirinale.

Your affectionate nephew,

J. L. SPALDING

Belgian Coll. Rome
Jan 5th /65 [47]

To Most Reverend Martin J. Spalding
Archbishop of Baltimore

Dear Uncle

I received a few days ago your letter of December. I was happy to learn that you had entirely recovered from your illness. I went to see Card Barnabo yesterday and handed him your letter. He says he will speak to the Pope about the affair. I suppose there will be no difficulty in obtaining my incorporation into the diocese of Baltimore. Card. Barnabo will probably answer your letter himself. The Bishop of Louisville will probably be appointed this month. Barnabo said that the information required had already arrived so that he would be appointed as soon as possible. I will let you know as soon as I receive the news. Dr Smith sends you his respects. He has been very kind to me. I went with him to the Catacombs of St. Calixtus and he explained every thing very well. He has a good and warm heart as have most Irishmen.

I saw one of your old professors the other day, Father Theiner.[48] I suppose you have not forgotten him. He still remembers yourself, Uncle Ben and Uncle M. Lancaster. He is one of the most learned men in Europe. He is at present editing some of the Vatican manuscripts. He sends you his kindest regards. I sang Mass down at the American Coll. last Sunday. I go down to see them from time to time. They are all very kind and I think the College is conducted in an excellent spirit. Most of the students however seem to be in delicate health.

I had an audience of the Pope some time ago. He sends you his compliments or his benediction, I do not know which. He is in excellent health and is still strong and vigorous. I suppose you have received his Encyclical letter proclaiming a jubilee for 1865. The Propositions [49]

[47] BCA, 37A-7.

[48] Augustin Theiner (1804-1874), renowned historian of canon law, was prefect of the Vatican Archives during the years 1855-1870.

[49] The Syllabus of Errors was issued with the encyclical *Quanta cura* on December 8, 1864.

annexed make a good deal of noise here in Europe from the fact that many find in them a condemnation of the Catholic liberal school of Politics of which Montalembert is the leader in France and whose principles are generally admitted by the Catholic members of Congress in Belgium. This school however is not condemned, at least if we consider it only as a practical system applicable to Belgium, France and the greater part of civilised countries at the present day. In the U. S. this school is the only practical school in this age and probably for ages to come. I believe however that our American principles are fundamentally false as is the general tendancy [*sic*] of Modern Society. But the present state of Society is a fact which we can not get rid of and consequently we must accept it and try to make the best out of it.

Even when a school boy I never had much faith in what the spirit of the age calls Liberty and now I have less than then. Liberty is only one of the many means which crafty and strong men make use of to tyrannise over the people. The people is the most gullible animal on earth and where it is King fools inevitably rule. Paucis vivitur humanum genus. The human race had always lived for only a few men and in this respect things have not changed in the nineteenth century. The people labors, sweats and dies in order to satisfy the lust and pride of a few worthless men who themselves are slaves. I am not a socialist. But when I see tyrants and constitutional fools and liars seeking to tear religion from the hearts of the people, of those who labor and are poor, under pretext of making them free, I wish we had an age of faith and strength like that of Gregory VII and a friend of the people to anathematise those base tyrants and to send them crouching from the face of an outraged world. Here in Europe I know those men who talk of Liberty of progress of the Sovereignty of the people and of accomplished facts and I abhor them and their principles. When I look over to our own country I see that those same principles have ruined it, torn it asunder and made us exiles and beggars in our own homes. It is because the people is King and Rebellion a right that the American people is to day a King without crown or Kingdom and a nation without any right except that of Selfmurder.

The war may be carried on very badly but I believe that the North is right in principle and especially I am for her because every shot fired is a protestation against the *right of Rebellion*, the omniptence of the people and the deification of the vulgar many. This is more than enough about politics. A priest however is necessarily deeply interested in every thing that is closely connected with the welfare of the human race. Politics in general is only the art by which knaves and thieves impose upon the people and dip their hands in the blood of nations.

You have probably heard also that the Philosophy of Louvain has been condemned. This however is entirely false. None of the doctrines of

Louvain have been condemned. Prof. Ubaghs [50] must change some of his propositions because ambiguous and susceptible of a false meaning if interpreted by party spirit, but the real doctrines of Louvain are not condemned and never will be, although as you know I suppose there be a strong party in Belgium itself which has serious doubts as to the orthodoxy of the Louvain teaching. There is nothing so sad as this prurient eagerness for finding heresy in every Catholic writer of talent and original thought who does not happen to think on every point as our own little selves. Besides being the source of divisions and disputes among Catholics which it would be better to avoid especially in our age, this passion for heresy-finding often weakens the energy and deadens the efforts of the best and noblest writers and champions of the Catholic cause. Probably one of the reasons why Brownson fell into so many errors was that there was no ignorant and self-conceited newspaper writer in the U. S. who did not take upon himself to denounce him to the world as a heretic. The Catholics of the U. S. have more need of being tolerant and charitable to one another than those of any other country for there the Church is composed of men of all nations and each one has his own national tinge of thought and feeling. But unfortunately we like most republican and liberty-lovers are the most intolerant people on the face of the earth. Our religious tolerance is no merit of ours for in the first place it is a national necessity and in the second most of us are tolerant of all religions because indifferent to all. In politics everyone must think as his party or if he dare be independent and tell the Truth, he is left without hearers or readers. There is no country in the world where public opinion is so intolerant of whatever does not flatter its own passions and prejudices as in the U. S. This is one reason why no great genius or hero has arisen in the present national crisis to save the country. In order to do something one must belong to a party and serve his party not his country; for party means littleness, egotism, self.

But I suppose, dear Uncle, that I had better stop here for all these speculations will not edify you or assure you that I am endeavoring to follow your very good counsel of being practical and letting the theoretical alone, for life is real, life is earnest, and man's vocation here on earth is to do and not to speculate, to act and not to theorise. This is more especially the vocation of every American for we do not believe in ideas, and knowledge for us is a good only in as much as it is commutable with dollars and cents. An American is worth only as much as he has and this makes me think of how little I am worth and brings me to another subject. I have only 1600 frs. I have paid my pension for six months, that is until April.

[50] Casimir Ubaghs (1800-1875) was professor of philosophy in the University of Louvain from 1830 to 1864, when his teaching on mitigated traditionalism and ontologism was censured by Rome and he retired from the University until his death.

I pay here in the Bel. Coll. 920 frs a year. I think if you have no objection I will start for America immediately after Easter. In this case, I expect I can manage to get home with my 1600. I would like however to buy a few clothes and some books. If you think the times are too hard I do not care much about it and will try to get home without troubling you for any more money. If you could conveniently send me some I might be able to pay you back some day or other should I ever become more practical in the U. S. I would ask Father for some but I do not like to do it because the times are so hard and he has suffered so much from the war. Do not put yourself to any trouble, dear Uncle, for the essential is to get back to America and I think my finances will bring me that far any how. If you think it would be better to stay longer here in Rome I am willing to [do] so. Write and let me know.

I received a letter from home the other day and Mother tells me that all are well. I have seen in the Papers that you preached at the consecration of the Cathedral of Phil.[51] The Bishop of Charleston[52] is still here also the Bish. of Montreal.[53] A plot against the life of the Pope was discovered here in Rome a week or two ago and the other day another against the government was detected. I think that Europe and even the Italian Revolution are convinced that Rome will and must belong to the Pope. Others think otherwise, time will prove who is right. Write soon and tell me when you think I had better start home. I must pass by Louvain for I left all my books there.

I enclose a letter for F. Russell. Please send it to him when you have an opportunity. Pray for me, my dear Uncle and believe me your ever affectionate nephew

J. L. SPALDING

Baltimore, Feb. 16. 1865[54]

To Rev. John L. Spalding—S.T. [*sic*]

Rev. Dear Nephew:

I inclose to you two letters, which you will please hand yourself to Cardinal Barnabó & Antonelli:[55] To the latter I introduce you, in the

[51] The cathedral of Philadelphia was blessed, not consecrated, on November 20, 1864. The consecration did not take place until June 30, 1890.

[52] Patrick N. Lynch (1817-1882), third bishop of Charleston, was sent to Europe in 1863 in the interests of the Confederacy. Permission for him to return to America was not granted by the Washington government until January, 1866.

[53] Ignace Bourget (1799-1885) was second bishop of Montreal.

[54] BCA, Letterbook of Archbishop Spalding p. 506.

[55] Giacomo Antonelli (1806-1876) was secretary of state to Pius IX from 1849 to the cardinal's death twenty-seven years later.

beginning of the letter to him as you will perceive. Have them placed in respectable envelopes, & direct them well. As I keep copies of all such letters, by a copying press, they are perhaps not so clear as I could wish; & if you deem it opportune, you may remark this circumstance to their Eminences. I think, however, they are legible—more so than the other two I last sent you for Cards Barnabó and Quaglia. I hope you receiv' that letter. If there should be any complaint, let me know. They say the ink becomes more distinct with time. You might inform their Eminences that we are a fast people, & that, by such a press, we can copy a letter in half a minute—the copy being perhaps better than the original. If they could introduce it at the Propaganda, it would be a great saving of time & labor. All are well as usual in Ky. I hear that Kate thinks of marrying her cousin Ralph Spalding. I am sorry for it. Write me soon, & tell me *facts & news*; do not write speculations. Father Russell thinks [the?] same, & that you are too speculative. God bless & preserve you. Your uncle M. J. Spalding ArchBish.

Baltimore, Feb. 20. 1865[56]

To Rev. John Lancaster Spalding S.T.L.

Rev. Dear Nephew:

I send you by this day's mail eight copies of My Pastoral on the Encyclical, together with a correct translation of the Encyclical itself & of the Syllabus. Please present them with my best respects to the persons whose names are written on the cover. I send you also a few lines of Introduction to my old friend Cardinal Reisach,[57] for whom one copy is marked. They are prepaid. Please, give the one for His Holiness to Cardinal Barnabo! If you see Card. Antonelli, as I hope, please ask explanations of the Nos. 55, 77, & 78 & 79—which will be construed here as condemning our system of religious toleration, so advantageous & so [next two words blurred in ms] to Religion. I fear these & some other propositions will furnish a pretext to the fanatics to persecute us, which they will probably do any how. There is a rumor that Dr Wm McClosky of American College, Rome has been appointed to Louisville. I cannot [*sic*] scarcely believe it.[58] Write me soon & give me all the news & what is said about my pastoral in Rome. Devotedly yr. M. J. Spalding, A.B.

[56] BCA, Letterbook of Archbishop Spalding, p. 507.

[57] Carl von Reisach (1800-1869) was professor of theology in the Urban College of the Propaganda from 1830 to 1836 and later archbishop of Munich and cardinal.

[58] The appointment to Louisville came on July 7, 1865, and it was Peter J. Lavialle, not McCloskey, though the latter was named to Louisville on March 3. 1868, following Lavialle's death in May, 1867.

All well as usual at home. No news more than you will find in the European papers.

Belgian Collegio, Rome
March 13th /65 [59]

To Most Reverend Martin J. Spalding
Archbishop of Baltimore

Dear Uncle.

I have received your letters together with those for Cardinals Barnabo, Quaglia and Antonelli. Card. Barnabo thinks that it is better to wait until your successor in the diocese of Louisville be appointed before asking the Holy Father to incorporate me into the diocese of Baltimore. Sede vacante nihil innovandum. The Bishops of Louisville, Albany and Nashville will certainly be appointed before Easter, at least so says Card. Barnabo.[60]

Card. Antenelli was very kind. He thanks you for your letter and says that he will himself write to you on certain points concerning which you demand instructions. I have made inquiries concerning the provincial councils of France and Italy. Dr Smith says that none of them can be obtained at the Propaganda. I since spoke to the Auditor of the Congregation of the Council of Trent, with whom I am well acquainted and he has procured me copies of several French and Italian Councils and will probably be able to find still some others for me. Some very important councils have been held in Germany within the last few years. I will try to get copies of those of Cologne and Vienna. That of Cologne is remarkably interesting.[61] I sent you last summer a copy of the last Edition of DeHerdt. I hope you received it.

There is little news here in Rome. The Holy Father continues to enjoy excellent health. They say that he has worked two miracles lately. One of them is the miraculous cure of the Princess Odescalchi which took place here in Rome some two or three weeks ago. There is no doubt as to the fact of her having been cured in a wonderful manner and I believe the general opinion is that it is a miracle. The Venerable Berchmans a Jesuit novice of the Archdiocese of Mechlin is to be beatified in May. I assisted last November at the beatification of Canisius the great Jesuit apostle of Germany. The martyrs of Gorcem in Holland are to be canonised this

[59] BCA, 37A-8.

[60] As noted above, Lavialle was named to Louisville on July 7, 1865. The same day John J. Conroy (1819-1895) was named second bishop of Albany and Patrick N. Feehan (1829-1902) third bishop of Nashville.

[61] Archbishop Spalding was anxious for copies of the legislation of these councils for the forthcoming Second Plenary Council of Baltimore which he convoked on March 19, 1866, and which met the first week of October, 1866.

year, but the exact date is not yet known, probably in November. The French troops still remain quietly here in Rome. The Holy Father I hear, has no intention of forming an army and all admit that it is the wiser plan. He has still some four or five hundred Zouaves, most of them Belgians but he will not increase the number. They are nearly all out at Frascati. The Carnival was brilliant and no revolutionary demonstration took place. The King and Queen of Naples took a balcony on the Corso and threw confetti and bouquets at a terrible rate. They say that a consistory will be held before Easter but that no cardinal will be created.

There is a rumor that the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia have written to the Pope assuring him of their protection in case of need. I scarcely believe this but I have no doubt that if France allows the pope to be robbed of what he still has, an alliance of the three great northern powers will reinstate him in his possessions. They say also that England is trying to get around on the side of the Pope. I hear that over in America you have discovered a great papal conspiracy for the recognition of the South. This is good news for newspaper writers. Bishop Lynch is still here in Rome and I suppose he himself does not know when he will leave. He did think for a time of running the blocade [*sic*] but it seems that blocade-running is knocked in the head. I think the South is nearly exhausted and the sooner she dies the better for all since there is no other way of finishing this war. I certainly grieve over the miseries of our country, but I perfer any thing to disunion. But I stop here lest I should begin to speculate. McClellan is here in Rome.[62] There are a good many Americans here at present both Northerners and Southerners. They do not associate however, but the Yankees remain together and so do the rebels.

We have had a very wet damp winter this year and here in Rome there is no way of making fire and the consequence of this is that I am visited by all kind of ruhmatic [*sic*] pains and indeed I have not been very well for the last month but now I think I am getting all right again. We do not have too much food nor that of the best quality here in the Belgian College and I need a great deal of substantial matter in order to keep me going. Dr. Smith has been dangerously sick but has now recovered again. You have doubtless heard the rumors about Card. Andrea.[63] He has

[62] George B. McClellan (1826-1885), Union general of the Civil War, following his defeat as the Democratic candidate in the presidential election of 1864, spent the next three years traveling in Europe.

[63] Gerolamo D'Andrea (1812-1868), bishop of Sabina, incurred the enmity of Cardinal Antonelli for his friendliness to the liberal movement in Italian politics. Cardinal D'Andrea was banished for a time from the papal court but recanted his political views sufficiently to be restored to favor before his death.

written a pastoral letter for his diocese which they say is pretty sensible. I hope he will have sense and prudence enough to behave himself a little better for the future. Some here seem to think that he is a little cracked but this is a way of getting over difficulties which I do not like.

I will leave immediately after Easter and be in Baltimore about the middle of May if nothing prevent. Pray for me, my dear Uncle, and believe

Me your devoted nephew

J. L. SPALDING

P. S. Your pastoral has not yet arrived. Some one told me that he had seen the first part of it in the German paper of Baltimore. Since writing this I have received the copies of your pastoral.

Baltimore July 26 1864 [64]

To Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D.

Rev. Dear Nephew.

I was much pleased to hear from you, however briefly & tardily. While I might repeat that you are not assigned to any particular duty, a little touch of self-interest—enlightened I trust—makes me less sad at the contingency as it may possibly induce the new Bishop to give you to me. I could soon employ you & both constantly & usefully. However, we must leave this to the march of events, which God alone can dispose for the best.

No news from Rome in regard to the new Bishop of Louisville, except that a letter from Dr McCloskey of the American College to Archbp Purcell expresses the opinion that F. Lavialle has been appointed, though no official announcement of the fact had been made. I do not know how reliable is the opinion. I have this moment received a letter from the Cardinal dated July 5.—not a word about the appointment.

Best love to yr Parents & my other Brothers Leonard & Joseph & families. Aunt Harriet Spalding is praying that you may come to Balto. Love to all yr. Bros & Sisters. Devotedly yours.

M. J. SPALDING, A. B.

P. S.

I expect to start to Warm Springs N. Y. & Saratoga early next week. I will remain about two weeks. Special love to Lenny—what is he going to do?

[64] BCA, 37E-40.

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

The Christian Philosophy of History. By Shirley Jackson Case. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1943. Pp. viii, 222. $2.00.)

This little volume by the former dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, who is now professor of religion and dean of the Florida School of Religion at Lakeland, is addressed to the general reader, not the scholar. Its purpose is didactic rather than expository, although from this point of view a division of the volume's contents is possible. In three of the seven chapters, the author exposes more or less objectively various explanations, both past and present, of how the course of history is shaped; in the rest of the book, he propounds his own doctrine on the same subject. Chapter II is of the widest possible scope; it attempts in forty pages to give an account of "the providential view of history" as held in varying forms by Hebrews, early Christians, apologists and Fathers of the Church, St. Augustine and his followers, typical mediaeval theologians, Protestants, Bossuet, Vico, and even the modern Neo-Thomists —Jacques Maritain, Christopher Dawson, and Peter Guilday, in the instance. It is a big order. As an outline sketch, the attempt is not without merit; for information about any of the writers cited and their views, however, the reader will go elsewhere. These pages demonstrate clearly the author's strongly evolutionary approach to religion in general and to his problem in particular. The third chapter on the human view of history is a brief, clear, and stimulating analysis of the scientific approach to history and the development of a purely empirical method in research and criticism. The author is obviously in sympathy with this development and appears to find its results completely satisfying. "The revival of historical dualism" by Kierkegaard and Barth, by Berdyaev, Tillich, and Piper, and in milder form by Heard, Macmurray, and Dodd, is discussed in Chapter IV. The author rejects all dualistic conceptions as mere mechanisms of escape from the stern realities, especially from the defects and calamities, of human history.

The last three chapters of the book on "The Continuity of History," "The Religious Significance of History", and "God and the Historical Process" give Professor Case's own explanation of how the course of history is shaped. He does not state whether the views expressed are those of others as well. Certainly many who glory in the name of Christian will have to dissociate themselves from much of what Dr. Case says. They

may even wonder why the author chose to include the word Christian in his title. In spite of allusions, usually historical, to "Christianity" and "the Christian heritage," there is little or nothing in his theory of interpretation of history that is specifically Christian. Most of it presupposes belief in a Supreme Deity only. There is no appeal to the teaching of Jesus Christ as a basis of interpretation; and, in Professor Case's system, rightly so, since Christ seems to have been but one more of those good men through whom God has chosen to work, even though "the clarity of his moral and spiritual insights glows ever more brightly with the passage of time." Revelation is "only what every sincere religious man believes to be divine truth, and it is capable of as much variation as marks the life and thinking of various different persons living under different conditions in the various periods of history" (p. 170). In any church, "functional efficiency is the measure of its worth"; it is idle to ask which type is authentic (p. 172). Religious dogmas and ethical standards are purely relative. In so liberal a system, it is hard to see what is to be the measure of the "good man" to whom repeated reference is made. If Adolf Hitler thinks that he is doing good, it is certainly not in the name of this subjectivism and relativism that one can gainsay him.

The best of Thomists would inveigh as sharply as Professor Case against "the theory of a normative past,' if it means that religion today is to be "only a replica of the past" (p. 6). But it is important to distinguish between including aught of the past in the present and maintaining in the present the "actuality" of the eternal. The humanism of St. Thomas and of the Neo-Thomists has been recognized and acknowledged by the author, a truly Christian humanism which shows man as "cooperating with God in determining historical events" (p. 53). At first sight, this position may seem to be little different from the "human activism" which Dr. Case so strongly advocates. But the resemblance is only superficial. While their doctrine is every whit as vital and dynamic as Professor Case's, and they too would deprecate any escapist attitude on the part of Christians in the world today, there is nevertheless the infinite distance of the Incarnation and the life of grace between the two positions.

GEORGE B. FLAHIFF

St. Michael's College
Toronto

The Reformation Refugees as an Economic Force. By Frederick A. Norwood. (Chicago: American Society of Church History: Studies in Church History, Volume V. 1942. Pp. x, 206. $3.00.)

We welcome this study which brings together much scattered data relating to the economic activities of Protestant refugees during the sixteenth century. The Bibliography presented by the author is a large

one. Even if there are omissions as, e. g., J. H. de Stopplaar's *Balthasar de Moucheron. Een Bladzijde uit de Nederlandsche Handelsgeschiedenis tijdens den tachtigjarigen Oorlog* ('s-Gravenhage, 1901), it seems certain that the essential facts are adequately covered. Accordingly there is little ground for criticizing the scope of the subject or the method by which the pertinent facts have been culled and arranged. It would appear ungracious to discuss the author's spelling of place names in the Low Countries, a notoriously difficult subject and one which probably never will be settled. But to read the form Lille on page 142 and Rijssel (Flemish for Lille) on page 143 is to add to an already existing confusion.

The last chapter deals with the influence exerted by the refugees on the economic and religious life of the time, and from page 159 we have a summary of it in the tradition of Weber and Troeltsch (who considerably elaborated Weber's startling thesis). The author expresses himself guardedly, for he seems to feel that all is not well with the theories of Weber and Troeltsch, especially as they have been employed in this country. The theme is admittedly complex; and, after considering Dr. Norwood's qualifications, one may well wonder just how much of their views and those of their followers remains to be accepted.

It is certain that the real significance of the development of mediaeval trade and industry, north as well as south of the Alps, is not sufficiently appreciated. In its way it was as important as the Industrial Revolution of the past century. An elaborate and highly refined economic theory was evolved. So we have the conception of the *justum pretium*, the sterility of money, the prohibition of usury, *damnum emergens, lucrum cessans*, the *poena conventionalis* for failure to repay the principal promptly, and laws against engrossing, forstalling, and regrating. Then came the revolutionary changes after Vasco da Gama's voyage to India, more important certainly in their immediate consequences to the economic life of Europe than the discoveries of Columbus which began to be felt only when Mexico and Peru were conquered. The result of these events was to rob the Moslem world of its position as commercial middleman between Orient and Occident and shift the European *termini* of trade and industry from the Mediterranean to Portugal and finally to the Low Countries where Antwerp leaped into prominence. A vigorous capitalism blossomed forth in this community which for two centuries had assumed an ever-growing prominence in the commercial life of the Low Countries. All the advanced methods of capitalism appeared in Antwerp—instruments of credit, exchange, banking, and bourse. (Cf. the writings of Ehrenberg, Goris, Laurent, De Sturler, Prims, and De Roover).

None of these phenomena can, of course, be ascribed to the religious refugees whose activities are outlined in this book. But this really is not Dr. Norwood's point. In line with Weber's views he thinks it is the capitalist *ethos*, scarcely existent before the advent of Calvinism, that was

to a considerable extent created by the Calvinistic refugees. The reviewer has never been convinced of this view. We know that Lutheranism never struck root in the Low Countries at this time. The first Protestants were Sacramentarians, drawn from the humanist elite of the upper middle class and restricted in number, as the late Professor Pijper has so well proved. From about 1525 to 1535 they were eclipsed by the Anabaptists, mostly from the country and lower classes in towns. There was precious little Calvinism in those parts before 1570 as Professor De Vries has shown in his two volume work, *Genève Pépinière du Calvinisme Hollandais* (Fribourg-La Haye, 1918-1924). About that time began the political struggle of Spain to retain control of the Low Countries and hence the dispersion of zealous emigrés, many of whom carried the *ethos* of an advanced capitalism to communities less favored in this respect.

To prove conclusively that the religious spirit of these people, especially the Calvinists, was the prime factor in creating the new capitalist *ethos* obviously is a difficult task. From the time when Felix Rachfahl opposed this idea—and Rachfahl was as great a master of sixteenth-century history, especially of the Low Countries, as we have had—there has been a continuous flow of criticism against it. Neither Weber nor Troeltsch have an adequate conception of what is meant by asceticism. This becomes obvious when we read treaties like J. Lindworsky's *The Psychology of Asceticism* (London, 1936). As the question of the nature of asceticism concerns their idea of a special Calvinistic type of asceticism evoked by a special calling (*vocatio, Beruf*), this is a most important point. The result of such calling, as H. Bavinck has shown in his *Magnalia Dei* (Kampen, 1931) and A. Kuyper in his *E Voto Dordraceno* (Kampen, 1923-1924), was to lead man before all things to seek God's kingdom and His justice. Nor are Weber's assertions about the consequences of the doctrine of predestination in accord with the theology of Calvin's followers, as we may read in Bavinck's and Kuyper's great treatises. These people prayed to have a sure treasure in God's kingdom; they believed it wrong to labor essentially (even if in answer to "calling") for what the moth would surely corrupt. It is certain that in the northern Low Countries the spirit of the Reformed Church frequently was anti-capitalistic, especially in it general *ethos*, as Professor Hyma has shown in the *Journal of Modern History*, X (1938), 321-343. Finally, Professor Bernard W. Dempsey, S.J., in his noteworthy *Interest and Usury* (Washington, 1943), states: "The introduction of Calvin's ideas [on usury] in the late sixteenth century wrought no change in medieval thought" (p. 114). *A fortiori* this applies also to Luther's views and hence to most of the Protestants of the sixteenth century. Just how much of the theories of Weber and Troeltsch can be accepted is not certain, but it is far less than a good many writers suppose.

HENRY S. LUCAS

University of Washington

John Amos Comenius. That Incomparable Moravian. By Matthew Spinka. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1943. Pp. ix, 177. $2.00.)

John Amos Comenius, educator, churchman, and "last of the Moravian bishops", sought to bring peace and harmony out of chaos fanned by the Thirty Years War through an "ecumenic unity" of Baconian pansophic education that would supplant the ecclesiastical unity of the Church of Rome. Comenius' contributions to education merited for him the sobriquet of being the "father of modern pedagogical theory and practice." In fact many modern methods of education might be traced to his *Magna didactica*, the *Orbis pictus*, and the *Janua linguarum* which have remained standards for centuries.

Although Dr. Spinka classified him and his Hussite Moravian Church among the "Left Wing Reformation Groups", Comenius was sufficiently identified with Luther to seek the latter's approval of his own church, to place the Bible as the sole norm of faith, and to write a book, *Retunk proti Antikristu*, against the pope whom he styles, "the Anti-Christ, the man of sin, the son of perdition, the most dangerous seducer of the world" (pp. 2-3).

Not all will agree with the author that such vile denunciation against the pope bespoke promising beginnings of the gifted and excellently trained pastor of the Unity Congregation at Fulnek (p. 35), or that it was due in no small degree to the "aggressive political maneuvers of the Jesuits", the "shock troops of the Counter Reformation", or that the Thirty Years War was accelerated or aggravated, or that the return of the Hapsburg dynasty to the Bohemian throne was synonymous with an "Era of Darkness" that only the Second World War after three hundred years was able to dispell.

While developing well the educational features of Comenius in Chapter IV, Professor Spinka's defense of his hero seems to have developed into an *ex professo* apology of Protestantism against what he terms "militant Catholicism", against "bigoted Catholic regents who gave the Jesuits a free hand and zealously cooperated with them" (pp. 16-17), and against such popes as Paul V who "personified the forces of religious intolerance and of aggressive zeal in behalf of the exclusive claims of the church" against whom Comenius "directed one of his earliest works—as bitter a polemic as was ever penned by him" (p. 23).

That with such a religious background of virulent anti-papal militarism Comenius' Moravian Unity Church and ecumenic pansophic system of education were doomed to misbirth in their very embryo, appears quite evident. Time has given the verdict. Professor Spinka has used his sources well.

RAPHAEL M. HUBER

The Catholic University of America

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

History of Bigotry in the United States. By Gustavus Myers. (New York: Random House. 1943. Pp. viii, 504. $3.50.)

The author of the work under review died on December 7, 1942, three months following his completion of the manuscript. The project was conceived in 1925 and brought to fruition through the grant of a Guggenheim fellowship for the years 1941 and 1942. Mr. Myers had written four other works, the best known probably being his *History of the Great American Fortunes* (1909). An effort was made by the author to give an account in the earlier chapters of the present work of some antecedent persecutions of religion in Europe. Just why it should be necessary in a work dealing with American bigotry to go back to seventh-century Spain for a persecution of the Jews, is not altogether clear. That there were persecutions of the Jews in mediaeval Europe no one will deny, but it would be difficult indeed to establish any connection between the two phenomena in question. Tracing the historical roots of movements can be overdone. One might have conceivably begun with the pagan persecutions of the Christians of the first century, but it would doubtless appear as a work of supererogation. In these first chapters there are too many errors to convince the critical reader that the author was at home in the history of mediaeval and early modern Europe. We have space for only an example or two. In his justifiable strictures on the Visigoth King Sisebut of Spain for his presecution of the Jews, the author was at some pains to implicate the Church councils of Toledo in this severity. Mr. Myers does not tell us, however, that St. Isidore of Seville fought Sisebut's policy and that the fourth Council of Toledo in 633 rebuked the king by name for attempting to force Christianity on the Jews. (Mourret, *Histoire générale de l'église*, III, 250). Again, it is startling to hear the century which produced an Aquinas, a Dante, and a Roger Bacon referred to in connection with Louis IX as "his dark century" (p. 73). Benedict XIII certainly did not retain the loyalty of Spain in his obstinacy against Martin V until the former's death in 1424 (p. 76); nor were Aragon and Castille united by the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella in 1474 (p. 76). Practically the entire chapter entitled "Some Antecedent Persecutions" is based on Gibbon, Milman, Holingshed, and Prescott with little or no use of any of the recent scientific literature that has rendered obsolete large sections of these earlier works.

However, when Mr. Myers reached the heart of his subject, bigotry as it showed itself in American history, he entered on firmer ground. It is a sad story and the author succeeds, in the main, in telling it in an objective manner. However, nowhere do we find his definition of bigotry and throughout he concentrates on bigotry's religious manifestations, although the term is more inclusive than sporadic outbreaks against the religious opinions of contrary social groups. True, religion and race were the prin-

cipal wellsprings for this tragic stream running through our entire history, but there were forms of bigotry other than religious and racial which brought outbursts of passion and violence and these Mr. Myers notices scarcely at all.

A major part of his story is devoted, naturally, to the recurring outbreaks against the Catholic Church which have marked America's story from the first establishment of English settlers in the early seventeenth century, bearing with them their hatred for popery, up to and including the Ku Klux Klan of the 1920's. In the main Mr. Myers has told his story well, although the reviewer feels that had he given more attention to some of the excellent monographic literature of recent years he would have improved his book. For example, a reading of Billington's *The Protestant Crusade* would have given him a knowledge of the importance of the visit of Archbishop Bedini in 1853 and its subsequent violence. This would form a part of the chapter in which so much space is given to the visit of the apostate priest, Gavazzi, in the same year (pp. 189-193). Mr. Myers relied almost entirely on printed sources, in itself a good practice, but the *Congressional Globe*, statute books, and the daily press should have been supplemented by a reading of the careful research of a half dozen American scholars who have brought the history of various phases of American bigotry under close and skillful scrutiny.

The author is justly indignant with the spread of the current anti-Semitism, and over one fifth of the volume is devoted to a survey of the leading facts concerning its rise in the United States during the last two decades. Much of the story centers itself in Detroit from the publication of the articles in the *Dearborn Independent* appearing in 1920 down to the barring of *Social Justice* from the mails in May, 1942. In his zeal for explaining the alarming growth of anti-Semitic feeling in America Mr. Myers apparently lost sight of the continuance of anti-Catholic bigotry into the present decade in the columns of such publications as *The Protestant Digest*, though the author was not unaware of the contents of that publication since he quotes it in denunciation of anti-Semitism (pp. 479, 481).

The book gives evidence of hasty workmanship in a number of particulars. There are altogether too many barbarisms in the use of the mother tongue. We have space for only a few examples: "It was not until much subsequently..." (p. 249); ..."Judge Raulston, speaking in the much newspaper-noticed Calvary Baptist Church..." (p. 302); the "fairly long existence of the Social-Democratic Party in Germany and the large vote it had polled had made the name Socialist much of a household familiar" (p. 374). These are typical of the many jarring constructions and expressions which the reader constantly meets. Probably had Mr. Myers lived he would have polished off the style to make it more acceptable. The book contains many minor errors. The following may serve as samples. John Hughes was bishop not archbishop of New York in 1840 (p. 168);

the word Mr. Myers wanted was 'transubstantiation' not 'substantiation' to express the Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist (p. 169); Bishop Kenrick of Philadelphia was never 'Cardinal Francis Patrick' (p. 176) and his brother was Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, not 'Archbishop Richard' (p. 198). In the matter of typographical errors we might cite 'Dod' for 'Dodd' (p. 84), 'Wendle' for 'Windle' (p. 294) along with errors on pages 317, n. 3, 417, and 421.

Allowing for the awkward style of writing, for the errors of interpretation and of fact, and for the failure of the author to probe more deeply into the general *milieu* that gave rise to some of these movements, he has written a handy compendium which will prove of interest and, we hope, of worth in sobering our reading public about America's having always followed the path of sweetness and light. Our patriotism will not suffer from knowing this pathetic side of our national history; in fact, a serious reading of the history of bigotry in our midst may assist all of us in acquiring a more charitable attitude towards our neighbor and bring us closer in our efforts to make such outbursts less frequent and less violent, if we cannot anticipate in this imperfect world the complete eradication of bigotry and its evil influences from the American scene.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America

The Urban Impact on American Protestantism 1865-1900. By Aaron Ignatius Abell, Professor of History, Nazareth College, Rochester, New York. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. x, 275. $3.75.)

In all Occidental lands the rapid growth of cities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries brought acute problems to the churches. Great building programs had to be undertaken to care for the new populations and radical adaptations of methods made to meet the changing conditions. In no land was the situation more urgent than in the United States and for Protestants. The United States began its national existence as a country overwhelmingly rural and with no large cities. Only a small minority of the population were members of churches. Most of these were Protestants. Protestant church methods were, therefore, designed to meet the conditions in rural areas and small towns. By the end of the nineteenth century the country was rapidly becoming urbanized. In the cities the older sections were increasingly occupied by the newer immigration. Only a minority of that immigration was traditionally Protestant and of the Protestants relatively few were of the denominations of the older American stock. Those of that ancestry tended to move to the suburbs. Usually they took their churches with them, or, more accurately, their churches followed them. That in itself involved extensive building and readjustment. Yet Protestants were by no means unmindful of the problems remaining in the

centers and in a variety of ways and through a number of methods, many of them novel, sought to solve them.

Professor Abell has set himself to describe these Protestant efforts during the crucial three and a half decades between the Civil War and the new century. His study was undertaken as a doctoral dissertation at Harvard. It is marked by wide and painstaking reading in the sources and in pertinent secondary literature. That reading lies at the basis of the carefully-written text and is documented in full footnotes and bibliography. The monograph is scholarly and competent. It is in part in an area which has recently and brilliantly been covered by Hopkins in his *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915*. Strangely enough there seems to be no recognition of Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought*, which has much to say of the same issues.

The reviewer finds himself wondering how much the author really knows of the inwardness of American Protestantism. Why should a chapter be given to the Salvation Army and, in comparison, so little be said of the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations? These, even more than the other, were attempts of American Protestantism to meet the new conditions and were more prominent and more extensive. More discerning appraisal, moreover, would have raised such questions as why Congregationalists provided more leadership in meeting social issues than did Lutherans, and why Methodists and Baptists, both drawing predominantly from the same elements in the older American stock, took, in general such different attitudes toward the social problems of the urban age, and that in spite of the fact that from the Baptists came Walter Rauschenbusch. For even a recognition of these and some other important questions we look in vain in this informing book. Nor is there any attempt to discover whether in the urban areas the older American Protestantism was increasing its hold on its traditional constituency, the older American stock. There is reason to believe that it was doing so, but the subject still requires careful investigation before generalizations can wisely be ventured.

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

Yale University

GENERAL HISTORY

A Short History of Civilization. By Henry S. Lucas, Professor of European History in the University of Washington. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1943. Pp. ix, 994. $4.50.)

Professor Lucas presents a new textbook for a course in the history of civilization in which " political, social and economic phenomena " have been purposely subordinated to a fuller presentation of general cultural development. Certainly the author must be credited with fulfilling his purpose,

as proposed in the Preface to his work. Clearly it is Professor Lucas' contention that students are to be introduced to culture chiefly from a review of the world's wealth of literature, art, and intellectual life. It is his belief apparently that politics and economic influences have been given too much emphasis in survey courses. Perhaps the author has much on his side. Certainly the question of the widely employed survey course in world history could profit by a few well-planned reductions in scope.

It appears to this reviewer, however, that the author by his definition of culture is obliged to include at least a bit more of the political outline of events in his book. By definition, Professor Lucas holds that culture is: "the characteristic attainments—social, political, economic, intellectual, artistic, and religious of a group of people" (p. 2). Since at least a skeleton of political history would be useful in some portions of the work, we think the too-free omission of this phase of world historical events weakens the text for teaching purposes. Cultural developments often are the result of certain political changes. Would not one be able, for example, to show more clearly the cultural changes of certain periods through political developments than through actual manifestations of the changes effected?

The book has much to recommend it to Catholic readers. There are few if any errors concerning the history of the Church and her doctrine. Some, on reading certain passages, may think that a few unfortunate juxtapositions suggest erroneous interpretations. For example, in preparing the reader for the foundation of Christianity, the author points out that the use of external signs to indicate spiritual changes is an ancient custom. When immediately followed by an explanation of the Catholic sacramental system one might, without much ground, assume that the author would indicate a pagan origin for the sacraments. Throughout the book the author manifests a clear perception of the value of Christianity to western civilization. The old bromidic carping against the Church's mission, educational efforts, clergy and her influence on civilization is refreshingly absent. Professor Lucas understands the Church and churchmen.

In portraying the world's culture, the author does not neglect the Orient. At proper intervals we are given an excellent summary of the culture of the East. This addition will be appreciated, particularly because the field has been so sadly neglected. Noteworthy too is the author's constant warning concerning the importance of the Dark Ages and Byzantium. The writing of history has come a long way out of narrowness and blindness to truth when we have authors who insist that the Dark Ages must be understood and that Byzantium must be appreciated for its preservation of so much that we treasure.

For the Catholic college, probably the chief objection to the work will lie in the early chapters. While Professor Lucas is far from accepting materialistic evolution as a fact, the format of the book would lead young

students to believe that too much emphasis is placed on the theory because of the series of pictures. The reproduction of cuts from the Field Museum alone leaves this impression. However, there is nothing, we believe, in the text itself which will be found to be at variance with Catholic teaching on this subject. Attention should be called to the section on mediaeval history in which, of course, the author is at his best. Perhaps most noteworthy is the clarity of perception manifested concerning the philosophical studies of the times. The philosophical systems of the Scholastics are presented and evaluated with excellent results.

The publishers have presented an attractive volume. The type is exceptionally readable. The book abounds in fine reproductions of classical paintings. Maps for the work have been drawn by people who know the needs of students. The present reviewer would not adopt this book for classroom use as a text, but it will certainly be useful for reference, and for those who subscribe to the viewpoint of the author, probably no present book will be quite as satisfactory as this.

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

St. Louis University

Plans for World Peace through Six Centuries. By Sylvester John Hemleben, Head of the Department of History and Social Studies, School of Education, Fordham University. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1943. Pp. xiv, 227. $2.50.)

This is a very useful introductory study of the attempts made by scholars, statesmen, and philosophers to study the problem of the elimination of war. Beginning with Pierre Dubois, Professor Hemleben outlines the plans of Dante, Marsiglio, Erasmus, Crucé, Sully, Grotius, Penn, Bellers, the Abbé de St. Pierre, Rousseau, Bentham, Kant, Saint-Simon, Alexander I, and Nicholas II. The discussion of these plans leaves something to be desired on several points. The section on Grotius, for example, neglects to point out that after the Protestant Revolt tore into shreds "the seamless garment of the Lord", even a Protestant such as Grotius found it necessary to try to find some moral background for dealings between nations. *On the Law of War and Peace* is, to a very great degree, an attempt to piece together the shreds of international morality but without binding them all in the Universal Church. Somewhat more emphasis might have been put upon the motives of the various sponsors of these plans. Some discussion of why the English liberals wanted peace might well have fitted in. The ideas of Adam Smith might have been subjected to analysis since much of nineteenth- and twentieth-century thinking on peace has been based upon *The Wealth of Nations.* In dealing with the Holy Alliance, more attention should have been paid to its genesis. As early as 1805, Alexander I suggested arbitration and mediation with the

establishment of a league and a new code of law. Pitt responded that a mutual guarantee of their possessions would be preferable.

More attention might also have been given to the Concert of Europe as an attempt to enforce peace. Although the names of Metternich, Burke, and De Maistre have long been in disrepute, a discussion of their analyses of the evils of nationalism of the Jacobin variety would be fruitful in these days. It would also have been well to inquire into the reasons why Nicholas II proposed the Hague Tribunal. The section on "Programs of the Great War Period" is far too brief. No attempt has been made to show why the Anglo-American and French plans for the peace were so far apart. The conflict between the Wilsonian concept of a league of nations based upon mutual consent and the French plan of Bourgeois to enforce the peace through policing if necessary, has been neglected. While the usual attention has been paid to Wilson's Fourteen Points, it is regrettable that the speech made by Wilson at Mount Vernon on July 4, 1918, dealing with four points of the peace has been neglected. There is one principle outlined in the Mount Vernon speech not embodied in the Fourteen Points. That is point three in which Wilson stated, "The consent of all nations to be governed in their conduct towards each other by the same principles of honor and of respect for the common law of civilized society that governs the individual citizens of all modern states in their relations with one another". It was this principle which was utterly neglected at Versailles since it was in conflict with the old school of diplomatic thought and imperialistic traditions which rejected morality in international affairs.

Professor Hemleben's study as a whole is well worth reading and provides much material for reflection on peace plans of the past. One could almost wish that it had been a much larger volume with more space devoted to the comparisons between the various plans and the reasons why they were never adopted. In this way the study would have avoided the danger of becoming a compilation of plans.

JAMES M. EAGAN

College of New Rochelle

Czechoslovakia in European History. By S. Harrison Thomson. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1943. Pp. viii, 390. $3.75.)

Among the many instructive observations which the well-known editor of the *Journal of Central European Affairs* has made in his recent book on Czechoslovakia, no one is more enlightening and of a more general importance than his introductory statement about "the vital immediacy of the past" deeply affecting all Central Europeans (p. 5). Professor Thomson also emphasizes the "consciousness of historical realities," which marked the Czech struggle for independence as well as post-war Czecho-

slovakia (p. 157, cf. pp. 160 ff.), and he recalls the "tragically disregarded truism" that "the roots of most European problems are to be found in the dim obscurity of distant centuries" (p. 196, with special reference to Slovakia).

Therefore, he was entirely right in retracing the history of the Czechs and Slovaks from the ninth century, thus correcting the widespread opinion that Czechoslovakia is a "new" country. It also was an excellent idea to show her thousand years past in connection with general European history. An exhaustive treatment of so large a problem was, of course, impossible in one, medium-sized volume. The specific points which the author has selected are treated in a series of essays and may be divided into three groups.

The second part of the book is undoubtedly the most original and significant. These chapters (from VI to X) are an outstanding contribution to the history of European nationalism. Discussing first the relations between the Czech and the German population of the country, then the modern development of the German group in Bohemia, the Czech national renaissance, and finally the destinies of the Slovaks under foreign rule, Professor Thomson has not only collected and ably interpreted a very rich material, but also shown, notwithstanding his natural sympathy with the Czechs, a high degree of objectivity in approaching the German side of the problem.

This effort towards complete objectivity is perhaps less evident in the treatment of the relations between the Czechoslovaks and the Hapsburgs. But also these preceding chapters, which in connection with two others, explain the constitutional position of the historic Czech State within the Holy Roman and the Austrian Empires, are full of important arguments, opposing the point of view of German historiography which simply considers Bohemia as one of the integral parts of the German Empire.

It was more difficult to offer something entirely new in the third part of the volume, telling once more the story of contemporary Czechoslovakia from the first to the second world war. The reviewer rather expected that Professor Thomson, whose special field of research is mediaeval history, would enlarge upon the truly European role of Bohemia in the later Middle Ages. And having recently heard a brilliant lecture of the author on Czechoslovakia's cultural relations with Italy, France, and England before 1620, he also regrets that his remarkable studies on these problems have not been included in this book, where we also miss a discussion of Czechoslovakia's contributions to European culture, even Komenský being only incidentally mentioned.

Finally, a Pole might be permitted to stress that he fully agrees with the author in his view of how desirable a closer collaboration between Czechs and Poles would have been through all the ages. But such a collaboration materialized more frequently than it would appear from

Professor Thomson's book, and the obstacles came not exclusively from the Polish side. It is difficult to admit that the relations of modern Czechoslovakia with her two Germanic neighbors were better than her relations with Poland (p. 310), or that Pilsudski hoped Slovakia might revert to Hungary (p. 322); and it was not the Vienna award which gave Hungary a common frontier with Poland, a solution which Germany strongly opposed.

But even in cases where Professor Thomson's book raises controversial issues, it is a splendid introduction to further investigations, and as a whole, one of the most valuable American contributions to the history of Central Europe.

OSCAR HALECKI

University of Warsaw

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Studies in the History of the English Feudal Barony. By Sidney Painter. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Series LXI, Number 3.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1943. Pp. 211. $2.00.)

The purpose of this work is defined by the author as an attempt "to trace the methods by which the feudal barons of England sought to draw from their fiefs the resources needed to satisfy the desires" for "luxurious living, power, prestige and outstanding services to the church" (p. 13). This definition of purpose, however, is apt to lead to some confusion for the reader since the desires mentioned as the motives for exploiting their fiefs are but "simple assumptions". Such they must, no doubt, remain; hence an already sufficiently complicated problem would be more comprehensible if the author had been content to state his purpose simply as an effort to trace the methods whereby the feudal baron exploited his holdings, without bothering about trying to give expression to his motives.

These *Studies* have digested a considerable store of information for the period 1066 to *ca.* 1350. Mr. Painter has made a painstaking study of the sources and adds no little to clarify the picture of English feudalism as presented by Round, Stenton, and others of perhaps lesser note. This is especially true of the latter half of the work in which he enters into detailed discussion of the various baronial resources—franchisal, feudal, and manorial. The chapter on baronial incomes in which he compares the value of various baronies over the period from 1066 to 1436 will be particularly interesting to all with a taste for mediaeval history.

The first three chapters, two of which are concerned with feudal and non-feudal obligations, suffer somewhat from a lack of clarity. This is due chiefly to the fact that the reader cannot be sure enough of the meaning the author gives to his terms. Thus, for example, he defines a barony as

"any tenure in chief of 5 or more knights' fees" (p. 26); he later informs us that "tenure by barony was not based on the possession of a certain number of knights' fees..." (p. 55); and a few pages farther on says "there was no clear rule as to what fiefs were baronies" (p. 61). While that may be a very graphic illustration of the fact that our knowledge of the details of the feudal system is extremely nebulous, nevertheless it needlessly complicates the reader's task. Another annoying feature of the first part of the work is the failure to define a term until sometime after much is made to depend on its proper understanding. Thus, for example, *desmesne* is defined on page 73, although the word has been freely used in the preceding pages. Clarity and ease of reading would also be aided considerably if the writer did not keep so close to details, if he would stand off and view his mass of facts in perspective, at least occasionally within a chapter.

These are no doubt minor blemishes in a study so replete with vexing problems as that which Mr. Painter has undertaken. However, if criticism of form rather than of content needs justification in the present instance, it might be supported with the observation that, if the gem is worth cutting at all, it should be cut well. With his facts and documentation there is no difficulty; with his interpretations some may differ; with one of his conclusions at any rate, namely, that baronial privileges were as complex in origin as were their obligations, all who read the work will be in complete agreement. Mr. Painter's every page makes realization clearer that we know too little about the subject. Hence any attempt to trace the methods whereby these privileges and obligations were put to use should serve the additionally useful purpose of stimulating further investigation.

CHARLES E. SCHRADER

University of Detroit

The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino. By Paul Oskar Kristeller. Translated into English by Virginia Conant. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. xii, 441. $4.50.)

In this study of the thought of Marsilio Ficino, the fifteenth-century priest and Platonist, the author has wisely adopted a twofold method: "On the one hand, we move analytically from the text to principles; on the other, we return, synthetically, from the principles so discovered back to the text." Adhering to this method, he has given a clear and full exposition of Ficino's doctrine. In the first part of the work, a chapter is devoted to methodological questions and another to Ficino's historical position. The second part discusses "being and the universe" in Ficino's thought, and in eight chapters the following subjects are treated: the concept of being; being and thought; the perfection of the world; the hierarchy of being; the unity of the world; causality; *primum in aliquo*

genere; *appetitus naturalis*. The six chapters of the third part discuss the following: internal experience; the knowledge of God; will and love; morals, art, religion; the theory of immortality; evil and outward life.

It is good to find on the author's part proper perception and appreciation of the place of Catholic theology and scholastic philosophy in the work of the famous renaissance Platonist. It would, indeed, be a fruitful task to develop still more fully the influence of St. Thomas Aquinas on Ficino. For instance, a more complete history of the Ficinian doctrine of *primum in aliquo genere* would reveal an interesting trend in scholastic thought. In this reference it is noted that although Professor Kristeller refers to the *Summa contra Gentiles* for the doctrine, he does not give its most striking application, viz., *Summa Theologica*, 1, Q. 2, Art. 2; Sed magis et minus dicuntur de diversis, secundum quod appropinquant diversimode ad aliquid quod maxime est: sicut magis calidum est, quod magis appropinquat maxime calido. Est igitur alquid quod est verissimum, et optimum, et nobilissimum, et per consequens maxime ens. Nam quae sunt maxime vera, sunt maxime entia, ut dicitur 2. Metaph. (*tex 4.*). Quod autem dicitur maxime tale in aliquo genere, est causa omnium quae sunt illius generis sicut ignis, qui est maxime calidus, est causa omnium calidorum, ut in eodem libro dicitur (*tex. eod.*). Ergo est aliud, quod omnibus entibus est causa esse, et bonitatis, et cujusljbet perfectionis, et hoc dicimus Deum.

It is to be hoped that *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino* will have a wide acceptance in this admirably clear translation in which it is presented. It is studies of this kind in the field of the history of philosophy that we need. The work is enlightened, impartial, and thorough. It should find a place in every college library.

JOHN K. RYAN

The Catholic University of America

MODERN HISTORY

The Life and Times of Sir Robert Peel. By Sir Tresham Lever. (New York: W. W. Norton Co. Pp. xi, 320. $4.50.)

Exactly a century ago the man whom Disraeli singled out as "the greatest member of Parliament that ever lived" was at the height of his career. Many drama-packed months were to run their course before Prime Minister Robert Peel would be impatiently repudiated by the strong protectionist faction of his party and catapulted into political oblivion. Perhaps the author intended to offer this admirable study as a centennial tribute to the memory of his countryman. However, he gives no indication of this nor does he assert that he was induced to present his full-length portrait of Peel because none has appeared since the 1890's. In the absence of any professed purpose, the reader may reasonably conjecture that Sir

Tresham Lever's somewhat subtly disguised intention was to project this great statesman's personality and career onto the contemporary scene to serve as a model and inspiration to those who must perforce come to grips with post-war and reconstruction problems not unlike those which were so courageously met and competently handled by Peel.

The Conservative leader was unquestionably a sincere and public-spirited reformer. Uniformly he subordinated personal and party interests to national welfare. Among the imposing monuments to his policy of making necessary alterations in the British constitution without jeopardizing what he considered its essential character, may be noted a vastly more enlightened criminal code, Catholic Emancipation, the establishment of a police force, improvement of the banking system, relatively humane factory legislation, reduction of the tariff and especially the repeal of the Corn Laws, which provided the poorer classes with cheap food. Against charges of inconsistency arising from his change of views on important questions, the author gives an acutely analytical and generally convincing verdict of acquittal. From his speeches, correspondence, and private conversations Peel is shown to have been a genuine convert to the doctrine of free trade. The sound reasoning buttressing his reluctance to initiate political reforms beyond those achieved in 1832 is thus satisfactorily exposed: "In his view it was not by reforming Parliament that you would make people honest, but by education, by elevating public opinion, and by the example and influence of individuals of outstanding character like himself."

While Peel's latest biographer gives a sympathetic appraisal of the man and his work, the account is by no means an uncritical, flattering eulogy. It is made clear, for instance, that his efforts to secure Catholic Emancipation were motivated not by a sense of justice but by a policy of expediency which dictated the move in order to prevent civil war. He was handicapped by a lack of imaginative foresight and not one of the great reform measures which he carried to fruition bore the stamp of originality. During the forty years of his public life Peel consistently created the impression of being cold, awkward, and morose; yet within the familiar circle of his intimates he was a most agreeable companion revealing a magnetic charm, a wide range of interests, and a delightful sense of humor. One of his most attractive qualities was his devotedness to his wife and children.

The narrative is enlightened by a host of incisive thumbnail sketches of contemporary figures and several excellent vignettes such as Harriet Martineau's diplomatic engineering of a *rapprochement* between Peel and Cobden. In general the author displays a refreshing understanding of Ireland and her problems. Many American readers, however, will resent the snobbish reference to President Polk as "an ignorant, vulgar, ill-educated man."

CLARENCE J. RYAN

Marquette University

Free Minds. John Morley and His Friends. By Frances Wentworth Knickerbocker. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. xi, 288. $3.00.)

This book is a study of the development and growth of mind of three Victorian friends, John Morley, Leslie Stephen, and Frederick Harrison. The sub-title, *John Morley and His Friends*, is more than justified, for by far the larger part of the work is devoted to the man who was editor of the *Fortnightly Review* for fifteen years, twice Secretary of State for Ireland, Secretary of State for India from 1905 to 1910, and the Lord President of the Council, who resigned in 1914 rather than endorse England's entry into the World War. The study is not a biography, but rather an analysis of the mind and the philosophy that animated Morley's career.

The reader is first introduced to the influences that helped to shape these "free minds;" he sees their family backgrounds, their days at Cambridge (Stephen), and Oxford (Morley and Harrison), their contacts with Mill, Comte, Darwin, Goethe, Wordsworth. With "Free Minds in Action" (Chapter IV) more attention is devoted to Morley who, after the not uncommon tribulations of the unknown journalist, became editor of the *Fortnightly* in 1867. He was essentially the crusader; the conditions of the working classes, the necessity of labor unions enlisted his ardent support, as did the sad state of Ireland under English mis-rule, and the effort for improved national education and for woman suffrage. Morley was truly one of the creators of the more radical liberalism, which he called "only Liberalism very much alive", of the early years of this century. He and his friends were also in the vanguard of the anti-orthodox rationalism of their day; it was perhaps prophetic that both Morley and Stephen gave up careers in the Established Church because they were unable to accept its beliefs. Morley's literary and critical work is given detailed study in the analysis of his *Edmund Burke, Voltaire, Rousseau, On Compromise, Life of Cobden*, and *Life of Gladstone* (called by some the greatest political biography in the English language).

The last several chapters are concerned chiefly with Morley's active political career. He was second only to Gladstone in his efforts to secure justice for Ireland; it was fitting that it was he who, as Viscount Blackburn, moved the ratification of the Irish Free State Treaty in the House of Lords in 1921. As Secretary of State for India from 1905 to 1910 he strove, with Lord Minto, the Viceroy, to bring to that greatest of imperial problems "sympathy as well as firm justice." His political activities during these years did not put an end to his literary crusading; his defence of democracy against such critics as Fitzjames Stephen (brother of Leslie), William E. H. Lecky, and L. T. Hobhouse offered full scope for his talents, as did his fight against militarism and the Boer War.

In perusing Mrs. Knickerbocker's able study, one cannot help thinking of the greatness of Morley had his mind been free with the "freedom wherewith Christ has made us free;" had he, in his Oxford days, received the same blessings of faith that came to John Henry Newman there but a few years before. That he himself was not unconscious of the lack of something very vital in his life may be deduced from his efforts to build up something to replace it, a "religion ... with one true voice, the voice of human pity, of mercy, of patient justice." Perhaps he was looking far back, beyond Henry VIII and Elizabeth, when he wrote to his friend Harrison: "Oh, that we were in those old ages of noble, grave belief!"

JOSEPH H. BRADY

Seton Hall College

Napoleon III. By Albert Guérard. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. xxii, 338. $3.50.)

The excellent bibliographical essay in this volume, which is neither a history of the Second Empire nor a biography of its Emperor, is sufficient evidence—if any is needed—that a more favorable view of Napoleon III than that popularly entertained in the Third Republic has long been in the making. Into this volume, the second in the Makers of Modern Europe series, Mr. Guérard has woven a good portion of this revisionist literature as well as his own views, with the result that like its predecessor in the series—Crane Brinton's *Nietzsche*—this interpretative study is both illuminating and provocative.

More important in the France of 1815-48 than her political evolution was the spread of Romanticism, the various spirits of which the author distinguishes as the rebellious, the picturesque, the conservative, and finally the humanitarian. The essential character of the latter was a promethean faith—a wrath at injustice, but it had specific aims: the assertion of human rights against the privileges of birth and wealth, the fostering by the state of the welfare of all—but especially its poorer—citizens, and the emancipation of nationalities. According to Mr. Guérard, the elections to a Constitution Assembly in April, 1848, revealed that of this humanitarianism France accepted the democratic but repudiated the socialist ingredient; the result was the 'June Days' and parliamentary reaction. Then, fearful of a reversion to 1793, 1804, 1814, or 1830, the nation in December, 1848, chose as president Louis Napoleon. This was owing not so much to his being heir to the Bonapartist legend of glory and material order, nor even to the very present dread of disorder, but to his being the representative of the true spirit of '48—of humanitarian but authoritarian democracy. To the intellectual-radical, urban, Parisian albeit European 'opinion of '48', he gave balance; for, while he represented the humanitarian striving he also represented order. How his regime came to be

regarded as 'reactionary' was the result, first of its association with the Roman expedition of 1849, or more exactly, the reactionary ends to which this intervention was directed much against the will of the President; and secondly of the *coup d'état* of 1851, which far from being a stepping-stone to tyranny was an unpleasant 'democratic' necessity to overcome a reactionary assembly. Now this is an interesting hypothesis. That Louis Napoleon shared the humanitarian aspirations of '48 is tenable on the basis not only of what he wrote and said but also of what he did. But to maintain that the France of December, 1848, was voting its preference for authoritarian democracy as such—or even in preference to another type of regime—is something for which the author does not provide sufficient evidence. That his final seizure of power was truly 'democratic' is even more open to dispute.

The final judgment of Napoleon III must be made on the basis not of the 'legitimacy' of his rule, however, but upon the achievements of the years 1852-1870. The first chapter in the portion of the volume devoted to this period, entitled "The Emperor and His Circle," is a brilliant sketch of the social and intellectual climate of the regime as well as of some of its principal court figures. The author's general argument is that the Second Empire's successes were greater than commonly supposed and that where it failed, its ruler was responsible to only a slight degree—and even then not because his ideas were faulty but because his will slackened. In the economic sphere there was not only prosperity, but it was genuine; in support of this he points to the peasant savings and the strength of France relative to that of Germany in the decade following Sedan. This is hardly conclusive evidence, but the more important contention is that the trend was attributable chiefly to the government. In the making of history individuals do not really play so great a role, but the degree of their appreciation of the underlying forces is important. Here is where Napoleon III was truly great. He saw the future was with industrialism, that this could not be conducted on an individualist but only upon a collectivist basis, that to have progress credit is essential—not in thrift but in credit is man's salvation—and so his government became 'the organizer' of credit. The resultant state capitalism was truly socialistic, not Utopian nor Marxist but Saint-Simonian, which meant, order being established, that under state supervision increased production should proceed along with a more equal distribution in behalf of all classes without a sacrifice of private initiative. Mr. Guérard believes, moreover, that the United States and Soviet Russia of 1943 are both in this great tradition, and that in Paris the cry should be not 'Back to Napoleon III' but 'Forward with Napoleon III'.

The political philosophy of the regime was perfectly in harmony with the above program. Napoleon III, according to Mr. Guérard, believed, as does he himself, that: "There are two kinds of government, the negative

and the positive. The first is a police for the protection of vested interests, the second an agent for collective progress." Consequently it is not surprising to find him evaluating 'The Liberal Empire'—the innovation of the 1860's—not as an achievement but as a concession, something of a hybrid between a sign of weakness and an added attraction. Now this is all very comforting to a generation which has witnessed the rise of the dictators and no end of pump-priming, but seriously, Mr. Guérard's absolute division of the kinds of government is definitely subjective. It leaves no place for that very objective reality—a positive government which is a police for the protection of all interests but is an agent for no other progress than that of improving the machinery whereby the first and true purpose of the state can be fulfilled. This true constitutionalism, the nature of which the author does not appear to appreciate, has undoubtedly lost influence in our century but the eclipse, temporary or not, has been calamitous. The mention of Burke and De Maistre as equally representative of conservatism does reflect something more—or less—than having been brought up in the Third Republic.

Napoleon III's further claim to our respect is that he was in the author's opinion 'a good European'. To a degree this is true—he did take part in the Risorgimento, talk French like a German, and serve as a special constable in England. That his advocacy of the principle of nationality as a European policy entitles him to this praise is, however, questionable. Not that he did not advocate it; for, like Wilson in our time, he was the champion of self-determination and of a family of European nations. Mr. Guérard resents such a scheme being considered a 'dangerous Utopia', for "that ideal was revived with apparent success within the Soviet Union; and it remains our hope for the Europe of tomorrow." If Napoleon's plan really was like that of the U.S.S.R. it was hardly 'Wilsonian'; but aside from that, can one consider as 'a good European' a ruler who weakened the props of an imperfect but workable international order to achieve what to him was a mere ideal. It is surely a poor defense to maintain that all would have been well had Napoleon "been understood and supported," when in fact he revealed such a poor understanding of and did so little to curb those disruptive forces which were becoming increasingly evident in European civilization after 1848. Decidedly the best of the three chapters devoted to foreign affairs is that on the Mexican adventure. Here as in the treatment of the war of 1859 and the struggle with Prussia, the mistakes of the Second Empire are well explained, but in each instance the responsibility for the failure is lifted from the shoulders of the author's hero. Again the hypotheses are interesting, but in the absence of sufficient evidence, they can hardly be accepted as history.

That Gregory XVI condemned Lamennais because of his support of political reaction (pp. 65-66), that Newman's explanation of *Quanta Cura*

was an "ingenious apology" (p. 110), that neither United States in 1861 nor England in 1688 underwent strains comparable to that of France in 1848-51 (p. 117), that British unwillingness to co-operate with Napoleon III was simply due to Gallophobia (pp. 181-84), that Napoleon's campaign for compensations in 1866-70 was an application of the principle of the "balance of power" (p. 191), may be taken as samples of particular views presented in this volume which are, shall we say, at least open to dispute.

A. Paul Levack

Fordham University

AMERICAN HISTORY

The War Governors in the American Revolution. By Margaret Burnham Macmillan, Ph.D. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. 309. $3.50.)

Students of the American Revolution have given their attention too exclusively to the careers of the military leaders, the financiers, and the diplomats. A few state governors have been accorded recognition, but, in general, these civilian leaders in the states have been slighted. To remedy this neglect Dr. Macmillan offers a full-dress presentation of the part played by them during those critical years. Her study first sketches the difficult transition from the governor as a provincial representative of the crown or proprietor to the governor as an American leader. Then she proceeds to a discussion of the executive's place in the new state constitutions, the problems that confronted him, his attempts at solution, his relations with the Continental Congress and the military leaders, the services he rendered the armed forces, and finally the legislative and political obligations that rested on his shoulders.

Admittedly the governor's position was difficult. Colonial history was, in large measure, a chronicle of the opposition of the legislature to the executive. This legacy of legislative predominance and interference survived in the new state constitutions, so that with diminished powers the governor faced increased responsibilities, and he had no precedents to serve as guides or norms. Moreover, the impossible was expected of him although he had little money and no credit. Small wonder that caution and a conciliatory spirit characterized his policies, especially when faction split the Whigs themselves. Danger too attended acceptance of the office, for Tories plotted their overthrow and the British set a price on their heads. War conditions were difficult to cope with, but invasion and actual conflict led to a state of disorganization hard to envisage. Nor was appeal to the Continental Congress of much avail. Indeed the governors were quick to realize that prompt action was more likely to follow an appeal to Washington, for he was personally acquainted with many of them, he

understood their problems, he sought their trust and friendship. Courtesy, frankness, and a due deference marked his relations with these sore-tried men. Difference of opinion there was on occasion, and plain speaking too, but these never undermined their mutual trust and reliance. Hancock alone was discourteous to Washington, not even deigning to reply to his letters.

Dr. Macmillan assures us that fully one third of the war governors gave evidence of leadership of considerable merit. Some were handicapped by brief tenure of office; capture cut short the career of several. Outstanding were Clinton of New York, Trumbull of Connecticut, Livingston of New Jersey, Reed of Pennsylvania, and Rutledge of South Carolina. Patriotism, energy, persistence, and personal sacrifice marked their careers.

In this scholarly volume the author makes students of the period her debtors. Objectiveness and careful documentation are evident throughout. The captious might quarrel over the space devoted to the militia, impressment, military trials, and the Tories, but these excursions were deemed necessary to a full understanding of the problems of the state executive. Lists of the governors and an extensive Bibliography are helpful. The usual excellent format of the Columbia University Press makes the text a joy to the eye and easy reading.

CHARLES H. METZGER

West Baden College

William Hickling Prescott. By William Charvat and Michael Kraus. (New York: American Book Co. 1943. Pp. cxlii, 466. $1.50.)

This excellent little volume is the twenty-first to appear in the American Writers Series under the general editorship of Professor Harry Hayden Clark of the University of Wisconsin. It is not a biography of America's romantic historian, although it contains much biographical material. Rather, it is an anthology of Prescott—representative selections from his writings, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes.

As in the case the volume on Motley in this series (*John Lothrop Motley*, by Chester Higby and B. T. Schantz), two editors have cooperated in the preparation of the Prescott work — William Charvat, assistant professor of English at New York University, and Michael Kraus, assistant professor of history at the College of the City of New York. Prescott was, of course, not just an historian but a "literary historian", and so the advisability of having one editor from the field of American literature and one from the field of history. The editors of this particular volume have further departed from the general plan of the series by presenting the Prescott selections, not under the headings of the volumes from which they were taken, but under topical headings. The departure has been a happy one since they have thus not only

demonstrated the "wide variety of Prescott's materials and his versatility" (p. v), but have made the volume more handy and useful.

The editors have done their work well, both in editing the many selections (they run to 463 pages of rather small print) and in authoring the very comprehensive Introduction. The selections are well-chosen, taken mostly from Prescott's four major works, *Ferdinand and Isabella, Philip II, The Conquest of Mexico,* and *The Conquest of Peru,* although there are representative excerpts from the *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies* and uncollected articles. No attempt is made to reproduce the voluminous footnotes of Prescott's writings, but a sample of his documentation is given (pp. 134-149) to illustrate his methods of citation, his presentation of proof, and his commentary.

The reader will find the Introduction to this work of particular value and interest. It is a psychological study of the historical mind of the romantic historian and a critical study of the style, value, and scholarship of the Prescott histories. Here the two editors have divided the work. In general, the results of the dual-authorship are good, but there are occasional repetitions of matter. Thus, the question of Prescott's picture of Aztec and Inca civilizations in the light of later discoveries is given by Kraus (pp. lx-lxi) and later on by Charvat (pp. cxviii-cxxvi). The criticism of Prescott on the grounds that he ignored social and economic history is treated by Kraus (pp. lviii-lix) and again by Charvat (pp. cxvii-cxviii). The book has no general Index, but has a chronological Index of selections arranged in the order of their appearance in Prescott's works. It is provided with a Selected Bibliography.

ROBERT J. WELCH

St. Ambrose College

Education in New Jersey, 1630-1871. By Nelson R. Burr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1942. Pp. ix, 355. $3.75.)

As the history of education in the United States is gradually being written, it is taking more cognizance of the contribution of localism to the various state systems and these, in turn, to the religious, social, economic, and other needs of American democracy. In his *Education in New Jersey, 1630-1871,* Nelson R. Burr adds another valuable work to the growing number of carefully-documented studies on the history of education in various states. The interaction of frontier, racial, and religious differences are treated, with minor exceptions, in a critical and scholarly manner as among the most important contributing forces which led to the rise and development of democratic education in New Jersey from 1630-1871.

The author shows an unusual mastery of the educational development of this period. Of the intrinsic merits of the parochial school tradition

in education, the author writes with a much more extensive knowledge and deeper understanding than the average educational historian. In speaking, for example, of the protagonists of parochial schools, he says:

> They made contributions to New Jersey schools which have never been justly appreciated; and after several generations of extreme secularization in the public schools, educators are beginning to discover the wisdom in some of their criticisms. Their failure at the time lay in their inability to see the great practical difficulties of establishing denominational school systems partly supported by public funds (p. 276).

In defense of those Protestants and Catholics who feared the rise of the common school as an undermining deterrent to religious belief which would end with a generation of intellectual pagans, he notes:

> Their criticism often went too far, but it is only fair to say that they were provoked by the rather arrogant assumption of some who looked upon the common school as an automatic saviour of society (p. 311).

That Mr. Burr, however, fully understands the unifying function of religion in education is rather doubtful. The fact that certain religious sects tended to exaggerate the religious aims and content of the curriculum does not vitiate the objectivity of the principle that the Christian spirit should permeate the whole educational system. Since "equal opportunities for all with equal abilities", has been the democratic principle underlying the development of the common school in the United States, the attitudes of some civic leaders should have been made clearer in regard to the conscientious opposition of their opponents who favored equal opportunity for their children in religious schools.

In this connection, for example, it would have enhanced the value of the author's study had he explained the following significant opposition to religious schools on the part of certain legislators:

> Probably more damaging even than the hostility or indifference of prominent laymen, were the withdrawal of public funds from sectarian schools in 1866 and the abolition of the rate-bill five years later. In some places, as at Newark, *there was evidence of official pressure to keep children away from parochial schools and compel them to attend the public schools* (p. 82; reviewer's italics).

Among the Catholic bibliographical materials quoted, there is no mention of: J. M. Flynn, *The Catholic Church in New Jersey* (Morristown, 1904); Walter T. Leahy, *The Catholic Church of the Diocese of Trenton* (Princeton, 1907); Frederick J. Zwierlein, *Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid*, Volume I (Rochester, 1925); and James A. Burns' two volumes, *The Catholic School System in the United States* (New York, 1908) and *The*

Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States (New York, 1912).

The book is enriched by ten very fine illustrations. It is definitely a required work for every student of the history of American education.

TIMOTHY F. O'LEARY

The Catholic University of America

Charles J. Bonaparte, Patrician Reformer, His Earlier Career. By Eric F. Goldman. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1943. Pp. 150. $1.50.)

This stream-lined account of Charles J. Bonaparte's early career served as a doctoral dissertation (1938) and despite the author's reluctance was printed at the urgence of the department of history of Johns Hopkins in view of the imminence of Dr. Goldman's induction into the military service. However, the brochure is no casualty, though the work would be much improved if the author had been allowed to make a full-length story such as Bonaparte deserved and as the family biography by Joseph B. Bishop failed to achieve, useful as it proved for this study. Revised after a lapse of five years—a good moratorium for all dissertations which must be published—the author might have avoided some of the characteristics of the insidiously interesting new biography, the smartness of youthful dogmatism, a touch of cynicism, a tendency to tag a politician or statesman with a comprehensive adjective, a flippant disrespect for his "hero", and a little less certainty of the evidential value of a reference. For the most part it is strikingly well-written, though at times vernacular, and sources of information have been shrewdly tapped.

The grandson of Jerome Bonaparte, despite three generations of mixed marriages, the infusion of nativist blood and a Harvard training, remained a devout Catholic and something of a Bonaparte. It is highly doubtful if his religion modified his Americanism or determined his political attitudes or his administrative procedure. The author is a little too certain of the influence of his "co-religionists," the "Catholic vote," and of the Catholic Church in politics. Impeccably respectable, assured of his social and financial position, a lawyer of parts, a candid speaker, no place-hunter, and "one of the few important American patricians who have been Catholics", Bonaparte could be a reformer and an independent thinker. He disliked seeing Catholics as such in partisan and boss-ridden politics; he favored the neutrality of public schools which otherwise would be Protestant; he considered the separation of church and state as beneficial to the Catholic Church; he fought political corruption in Baltimore and in Maryland; he was an aggressive civil service reformer in the ring of Roosevelt, Schurz, Foulke, Curtis, and Jenckes; he was deeply concerned with the anti-vice crusade; he was no advocate of education for

all men, for his democracy was tinged with aristocratic aloofness and conservative fears of the underprivileged at the polls; and he was no sentimentalist in dealing with social problems or minority rights. He was respected and heard, but neither beloved nor followed by his fellow citizens.

As a friend of Roosevelt and of Cardinal Gibbons, he was appointed along with Archbishop Ryan on the Board of Indian Commissioners. Dr. Goldman leaves the impression that in the controversy over agents and funds for mission schools that he served his Church without intimating that this was a disservice to the Indians. As a lawyer versed in trusts, he offered a way out as the redmen had some voice in the uses of tribal funds over which the Secretary of the Interior exercised trusteeship. Bonaparte found Roosevelt sympathetic but he discovered an unfriendly attitude toward Catholic missions on the part of highly-placed politicians whose creedal partisanship is not noticed. This problem of Indians and missions should offer an excellent subject for a detached study which would cover all denominational schools and not overlook general appropriations.

An undeviating reformer, Bonaparte served Roosevelt almost too well in the postoffice investigation which proved annoying to some Republican bosses on the eve of the 1904 campaign. Senator Lodge's attitude did not worry the "patrician reformer" nor discourage a man who as an overseer of Harvard University voted against an honorary degree for President McKinley. He had a keen scent for graft and inefficiency, and he was so amiable, smiling, and righteous that no one could easily challenge him — and certainly not Don Cameron. As a promoter of the Indian Rights Association, he was commissioned a special inspector of the Indian Territory, whose rule was in a muddle. A realist, he recommended to over-zealous friends of the redman the observation of a naval officer that "The Service would never be worth a——— until all the well-meaning people in it had been hanged." When Roosevelt assigned him to the task of finding a non-machine postmaster for Baltimore, the civil service-reforming Bonaparte after the refusal of a few of his prospects, named his father's able but inconspicuous cousin, who was appointed. Thereafter he had some difficulty in shutting his palatial doors to job-seekers.

Never, or at least hardly ever, on a ship, Bonaparte became Roosevelt's Secretary of the Navy until the Attorney Generalship was open. Theodore loved a great name, and he did want both a Catholic and a Jew in his cabinet, for no man had a better political understanding of the desire of minorities for reasonable consideration under the bill of rights. His friendship for Bonaparte was intense, but in the cabinet it was Taft and Root for policy-forming. As a believer in a large navy and an efficient department less controlled by heavy braid, Bonaparte was in complete agreement with the President and carried on effectively as a stop-gap appointee. He did arouse the patriotic societies by his recommendation that to repair the old *Constitution* was a waste of money or to show *Old Ironsides* with little of its old sides was fraudulent. The result was an exciting tempest,

and the *Constitution* still floats after a rather complete re-building. It was in this period that the dreadnought revolutionized navies.

Bonaparte as Attorney General became a trust-buster quite as much as Knox and Moody. He furthered the movement of federal regulation of business, thus inadvertently developing his detested bureaucracy which Dr. Goldman describes as "administration by thousands of little men who scarcely knew they had grandfathers and seldom owned anything except their two-story houses." In 1912, he was a "bull mooser"; in 1914, he advocated preparedness; and after the war he opposed the League of Nations. However, the "life" ends with his career as Secretary of the Navy.

Bonaparte deserves a definitive biography. When the current Napoleonic totalitarianism on the continent gives way to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, this reviewer would delegate this task to Mr. Goldman.

RICHARD J. PURCELL

The Catholic University of America

Apostle of Democracy, The Life of Lucy Maynard Salmon. By Louise Fargo Brown. (New York and London: Harper and Bros. 1943. Pp. 315. $3.50.)

For this reviewer, and for ever so many more like him who knew Lucy Maynard Salmon's published works, but did not know her personally, Miss Brown has rendered a distinct service. Until he read this biography Miss Salmon had been to the reviewer a rather legendary figure whose career had been integrated not only with the beginning and growth of women's colleges, but of organized historical scholarship and of mature and stimulating teaching of history in the United States. Very early in his advanced studies the reviewer was introduced to her "Appointing Power of the President". While still a student, her two volumes on *The Newspaper* came as guides to and through rich fields of historical materials. But Miss Salmon remained just a name, a figure. In the present biography Miss Brown has brought to life again the vibrant personality of Miss Salmon, devoted to awakening in her students not only a keen insight into the facts and processes of history and historical inquiry, but more pointedly a realization of the contribution each has to make that the history yet to be written may be more full, more satisfying, more complimentary to a civilized people. And this is the life story of a woman who lived according to her ideals.

That Miss Salmon merited the designation "Apostle of Democracy" the author has demonstrated, or better has let her heroine show for herself in numerous letters written at all stages of her long life on a wide variety of personal, academic, and social problems. They prove that her life and her teaching were one; democracy was for her a way of life. Equally significant were Miss Salmon's ideas on education, to her a process by which teacher and student advanced together, and her in-

sistence on the use of the scientific approach to the solution of all problems. Lucy Salmon, however, was human. She did not change her opinions easily, and the resultant inconsistencies are sometimes amusing, sometimes quite significant. More than fifty years of whole-souled teaching in a woman's college did not change her belief in the superiority of co-education. She would not accept honorary membership in Phi Beta Kappa because she considered the society to be undemocratic and the awarding of honors a debasement of true scholarship, but she did deliver an address on the establishment of a chapter at the University of Michigan and did accept an honorary degree. Her own unpleasant experiences with domestic help did not alter her views on the desirability of democratic management in the household, nor in the solubility of such problems by scientific standards, though she was too human to be coldly scientific in such personal relationships.

As successfully as the author has depicted the human Miss Salmon, shy, modest, kindly, helpful, devoted to her friends and her ideals, one is even more impressed by the persistent striving to make her teaching more meaningful, her students' lives richer and more fruitful. Nothing stands out more clearly than that her teaching was the center of Lucy Maynard Salmon's life.

Some may think that the author permits Miss Salmon to speak for herself too often and too fully. Certainly the many letters and excerpts retard the movement, but as the reader lingers with them he comes to know this grand person as it had been given to few to know her. So the reviewer repeats, Miss Brown has rendered a real service to those of us who knew Lucy Maynard Salmon's work, but not her; who knew her published writings yet had not experienced the inspiration of her teaching and her personality.

P. Raymond Nielson

The Creighton University

LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

New Viewpoints on the Spanish Colonization of America. By Silvio Zavala. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1943. Pp. 118. $1.25.)

These viewpoints on Spanish colonization in the New World largely concern the theory of Spanish empire and native labor, and, possibly because the author expounded them before the students of the School of Law of the University of Mexico, they are somewhat legalistic in tone. "...I stress the social point of view as a means of focalizing the study of colonization as a process", the author explains in his Introduction. "In so doing I point out certain errors that have resulted from applying predominantly political criteria, as our nineteenth-century historians have done with a few notable exceptions, in interpreting the colonial past of

Spanish America" (p. 2). He then proceeds to carry out his plan in ten chapters, viz., "The Legal Claims of Spain in the Indies", "The Papal Bulls of Alexander VI relative to the Indies," "Evangelical and Political Problems of Penetration in the New World," "The Doctrine of Just War," "Indian Slavery," "The Emancipation of the Indian Slaves," "The Encomienda as a Political Institution," "The Encomienda as an Economic Institution," "The Evolution of the Labor System," and "Spanish Colonization and Social Experiments." This is rather a big assignment for so thin a volume, but the author purposely set out to write a book not for the layman but for the student of Spanish expansion in the New World, particularly during the sixteenth century and especially in Mexico.

Although no serious student of Spanish American colonial history disparages any longer the role of Spain in the New World, it is good to have Sr. Zavala's authoritative conclusions on the subject. "Everything pondered and written in the sixteenth century", he writes, "reveals as a dominant note concern with the relationship between a Christian world (or, if you prefer, a European world) and a world described as infidel or heathen" (p. 6). Further he says: "...the act of the Pontiff [Alexander VI] respecting the lands discovered in America merits neither the excessive praise nor denunciation which have been heaped upon it" (p. 19). As regards the pope himself, "it is very probable that he had no personal knowledge of the Spanish negotiation at any time in its course and that it was handled entirely by the officials of the Curia in accordance with the ordinary procedure" (p. 22). On page 46 we read that the Spanish conquests in the New World, "in which religious and political motives were intermingled, closed the medieval cycle of crusades." It is unfortunate that the secularization of life in Mexico has apparently gone so far that Sr. Zavala seems to have found it necessary to address his Mexican student audiences as though they were perfect aliens to the Catholic tradition. This has unwittingly made the text more understandable to American non-Catholics, but it does not lessen the full significance of the observation.

Parenthetically one might add that Sr. Zavala's book contributes a great deal to the confusion in Hispanic circles concerning the word "America". Many will argue that "America" ought not to be a monopoly of the United States, but it stands to reason that neither ought it to be used by Spanish Americans in referring only to their own countries. That most ridiculous of makeshifts, "North American" for the "American" which our Good Neighbor policy has made taboo, appears now and then. Something ought to be done in this matter of language, for it is already proving embarrassing to call ourselves "Americans" at home and "North Americans" to our Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking neighbors.

There are a few minor slips, either the author's or the translator's, which were not caught. For "Henry of Susa Cardinal Bishop of Ostia" read "Henry of Segusio Cardinal Bishop of Ostia and Velletri" (p. 6),

and on the same page "canon law" for "canonical laws." On page 17 (and elsewhere), "West Indies" is a poor rendition of what obviously was "Indias occidentales" in the original; "Cape Bojador" for "Cape Bogador" and "Afonso V" for Alfonso V" (p. 18); to call the Cardinal of Ostia "Canon Ostiensis" is hardly appropriate (p. 21). Dr. Marchant's *From Barter to Slavery* (reviewed elsewhere in this issue) is rather loosely described as a study on Indian slavery in sixteenth-century Brazil (p. 68 n). Finally instead of the Spanish "visitadores", read "visitators" (p. 90); the office also exists in English-speaking countries.

MANOEL DA SILVEIRA CARDOZO
The Catholic University of America

California's Missions: Their Romance and Beauty. By Hildegarde Hawthorne. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co. 1942. Pp. viii, 237. $5.00.)

Whenever an author takes up some oft-told tale of history to write of it again, one naturally presumes that the work will display some new information or new interpretation. In this book on California's missions by Hildegarde Hawthorne there is neither new information nor new interpretation. It is "just another book on the California Missions," albeit a very attractive deluxe edition. Why the author wrote this book, the reader is left to speculate. It has no Foreword or Preface. The story starts at full speed, without preliminary or apology.

The presentation of the mission story is in the conventional manner of George Wharton James, John Berger, and Mrs. Fremont-Older. The opening chapter sketches the "Story Back of the Missions" and is followed by single chapters on each of the missions in the order of their founding. The method of treating the individual missions is "by recording what is of the past and what is of the present, as one might speak of the members of a family to a visitor in a portrait gallery" (p. 24). The treatment is everywhere sympathetic and the author demonstrates a considerable understanding of the purpose and spirit of this great Franciscan missionary effort.

The author has the historical facts of the mission story well in hand, although her sources of information are not revealed and there is no Bibliography. The only clues to sources are a reference to Charles Chapman's *History of California. The Spanish Period* (pp. 30-31) and a reference to Vancouver's notebook (p. 85). The use of the Spanish accent-mark in proper names is arbitrary and inconsistent throughout the book. For example, it is used in Viscaíno (p. 2) but not in José de Gálvez (p. 4), in Junípero Serra (p. 144) but not in Palóu (p. 152).

The appeal of this book is vastly increased by the inclusion of forty-eight illustrations of the missions in pencil-drawing by the late E. H. Suydam. The drawings have a distinct charm and are well suited to the subject matter of the volume. Despite their unquestioned excellence,

they should perhaps have been relieved by an occasional photograph, sharp line-drawing, or wood-engraving. The general effect is monotonous especially since the illustrations completely dominate the book. Evidently the drawings were not conceived as an integral part of the work. To the layman's point of view, it is rather disturbing to see crowding of the illustrations at the right and left, with great blank spaces at the bottom. The drawings appear to have been taken from the sketchbook of the artist who seemingly drew them with a view toward a horizontal format. Unfortunately, every drawing has been forced into the vertical format of the book.

ROBERT J. WELCH

St. Ambrose College

Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, 1579-1936. Volume V, *The Mission Era: The End of the Spanish Regime, 1780-1810.* By Carlos E. Castañeda, Ph.D., LL.D., K.H.S. (Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones Co. 1942. Pp. 514. $5.00.)

Another volume has been added to a series that is very adaptable to the plan for American historical studies as proposed by Professor Herbert E. Bolton, at the Toronto meeting of the American Historical Association in 1932 (cf. *American Historical Review*, April, 1933). It has particular value for students of the late Spanish colonial period because of the numerous citations from documentary evidence. Furthermore, the author has made an exhaustive analysis of the events and motivation that led to the abandonment of the mission system by the Bourbon regime. It is noteworthy that Professor Castañeda has not only presented an objective evaluation of the earnest endeavor of officials to preserve a vast territory for the Spanish crown, but he has also shown how the zeal of Fray Manuel Silva in promoting the foundation of new missions, namely those centering about Nuestra Senora del Refugio, led to the acceleration of the actual secularization of missions in Texas.

In addition to this thorough treatment of a subject rarely attempted by scholars, the author's contribution sheds light on topics of American history. He gives conclusive evidence that Spanish officialdom was fully aware that the consequences of the American Revolution presented a threat to the Spanish domain and bent every effort to avert it by restricting the infiltration of traders. A comprehensive study is made of the Spanish policy following the Treaty of San Lorenzo and the eventual retrocession of Louisiana in 1795. It clarifies the position that the closing of the door to Americans was a defensive measure. The intrigues revolving about Philip Nolan, Major General James Wilkinson, and Aaron Burr are traced from the earliest stages, and an objective scrutiny of these clashes with the United States is facilitated by an unique interpretation of the Spanish attitude. Anyone interested in the westward movement will find the

treatment of the immigration into Texas consequent upon the Louisiana Purchase very helpful. An entire chapter is devoted to the results of the French intervention in the Iberian Peninsula and its repercussion in Texas. A comprehensive survey of conditions in Texas about 1810 concludes this volume.

Nevertheless, the work is subject to improvement. Including a previously published paper as a chapter without some revision, disturbs the unity of the whole. It is disconcerting to read the lengthy repetition of a statement by the Indian agent, Juan Gasiot, calling attention to possible effects of the attainment of independence by the American colonies. Furthermore, though Professor Castañeda substantiates his exception to Bancroft's statement that "there is little to be recorded of Texas during the last two decades of the century", one is led to be sceptical because of the minutiae recorded. The chapter on the secularization of the missions reads almost like an inventory and financial report of the missions covered. The same is true of the enumeration of inhabitants and stock of the ranches and haciendas of Texas (pp. 416-421). Devoting a paragraph to items such as "fixing the time for Mass" (p. 199), "building a new guardhouse (p. 201), or "Texas' first dentist" (p. 410), seems superfluous.

ALPHONSE F. KUHN

University of Detroit

Mexico: A Century of Educational Thought. By Irma Wilson. (New York: Hispanic Institute of the United States. 1941. Pp. 376. $3.50.)

Although Miss Wilson does not say so expressly in her Foreword, it would appear that her study was done as a Ph.D. thesis at Columbia University. The book is marked by that meticulous sense of detail in footnotes and text that we have come to expect in works produced by American graduate students. The author is to be congratulated on her success in assembling a great mass of material which no one had hitherto brought together. Her style leaves a great deal to be desired, however, and she has an irritating habit of writing in the present tense and then switching to the past.

The author set out to make "a study of the development of educational theory, with special attention to the personalities as well as the ideas of representative leaders who have occupied key positions and exerted influence in the development of Mexico's pedagogical ideology." So far as lay leaders are concerned, she has done a good job. One can hardly blame her for not developing the picture of church education in Mexico during the past century when it is realized that such material is widely scattered and that we do not possess even one single general history of Mexican education in any century, let alone the nineteenth.

Among the most interesting aspects of the book, at least to the reviewer, are the following: the presentation of the activities of Protestant Bible

societies around 1827 and after (pp. 106-110); the intensive study made of the educational provisions of early state constitutions found in Chapter IV (pp. 111-143); the notes on the early work of the American Bible Society (pp. 185-189); and the concluding chapter in which Miss Wilson presents an evaluation of the work of Justo Sierra, one of Mexico's outstanding literary men and the founder of the modern National University. There is an Index of names and an excellent Bibliography of twenty-six pages for which all students of Mexican educational problems should be thankful.

Judging from Miss Wilson's Foreward, no Mexican scholar nor any Catholic had a chance to read her manuscript. While there is a sincere and honest attempt to present the extremely complicated picture of Mexican educational life in the past century, several things have been allowed to escape the author's attention, most of which could have been remedied if the proper authorities had been consulted. For example, on pp. 34-40, *presbítero* should be translated as "priest" and not as "presbyter" (pp. 34-40); then the reference to "fathers of the Third Order ..." in speaking of Franciscan friars (pp. 49-50); likewise the author uses the expression "taking the habit" to mean the reception of Holy Orders (p. 88). In her discussion of the work of the apostate priest, Dr. Mora, Miss Wilson does not once mention that he was a priest and an apostate, important facts in any evaluation of his educational philosophy (pp. 145-153). Similarly, in writing of the educational ideas of Valetín Gómez Farías, Mora's collaborator in political and educational reform in 1833, very little mention is made of the anti-clerical nature of the laws elaborated and enacted largely through the labors of these two men.

Moreover, we have an extremely favorable picture of a bitter anti-clerical, Ignacio Ramírez (pp. 197-208); and the author states, rather naively, that "the presentation of the historical background of the movement known as the Reforma" has been taken largely from "Altamirano's *Revista histórica y política*" (p. 209). Altamirano was the star pupil of Ramírez and shared his anti-clerical viewpoint. Finally, Miss Wilson states that the question of religious freedom was first agitated in "the press and private circles in 1848" (p. 11), whereas we know that it was thoroughly discussed and given wide publicity as a result of the public debates held during the constitutional convention of 1824 in Mexico City.

Aside from these few faults—and it should be noted that the proof-reading, especially of Spanish and French words and titles, is just about perfect—Miss Wilson's work should serve as a stimulus to Catholic scholars in both the United States and Mexico. We have long neglected the cultural and artistic side of life in Mexico and, therefore, have little right to criticize non-Catholics for not having read and used the books that we have not yet written.

PAUL V. MURRAY

American School Foundation
Mexico, D. F.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A new Catholic Inter-American quarterly review will be launched very soon. The new periodical aims to publish scholarly contributions in the field of the cultural history of the Americas. It will endeavor to provide a source of reliable and accurate information that will serve as a solid basis for mutual understanding for all persons of good will and strengthen the bonds of unity between the Catholics of the Americas. The review will be edited and published under the auspices of the Academy of American Franciscan History, which was founded last July at a meeting of representative Franciscan historians from the United States, Canada, and Hispanic America, assembled in Washington, D. C., at the invitation of the Most Reverend Delegate-General. The purpose of the Academy is to promote co-operative scholarship in the field of the history of the Franciscan Order in the Western Hemisphere. Headquarterrs have been established in Washington. In addition to the resident members of the Academy, whose work will be to assemble, catalogue, and edit source materials and to publish monographs based on these sources, there will be a group of corresponding members who will co-operate in the work of the Academy. Many scholars, prominent in the field of Hispanic-American studies, have signified their approval and promised their collaboration All communications should be addressed to the Academy of American Franciscan History, 16th and Shepherd Streets, N. E., Washington, 17, D. C.

The Reverend Robert F. McNamara, professor of church history in St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, is gathering material for a history of the North American College in Rome. Alumni of the College and all students of American church history will welcome this news, since Henry A. Brann's *History of the American College* (New York, 1910) was not a scientific work. Anyone having materials of value for Father McNamara's book would be doing a service to inform him of their holdings.

Whitney R. Cross, curator of the year-old Collection of Regional History, Cornell University, reports that "one year has sufficed to bring together source materials of promising quality and quantity, as well as to create a system of filing, classifying, and preserving acquisitions. The year has also demonstrated that the barns, attics, and desks of upstate families contain a wealth of data potentially valuable for students of history, folklore, agriculture, economics, education, religion, and other subjects."

The Canadian Historical Review for September, 1943, contains a plea and a plan for the preservation of historical materials which might well be followed in this country. The plea has been widely circularized by the Canadian Historical Association.

A Committee on American History in the Schools and Colleges with Guy Stanton Ford and Theodore Blegen as co-chairmen has been sponsored by the American Historical Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the National Council for Social Studies. The Committee has made a survey of conditions in this field and presented a report. The report will be discussed in a joint session of the American Historical Association and the National Council for Social Studies at the annual meeting in New York.

James F. Kenney of the Public Archives of Canada, and an advisory editor of the REVIEW, was one of the principal participants in a session of the seventh annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists held at Princeton University on November 15-16. Dr. Kenney and Margaret Norton of the Illinois State Library were the leaders of a discussion entitled: "What Distinction Should be Made between Archives and Historical Manuscripts?"

Adelaide E. Minogue of the staff of the National Archives is the author of No. 5 of the Archives' Bulletins entitled *The Repair and Preservation of Records*. A paper by Dr. Ernst Posner on *The Administration of Current Records in Italian Public Agencies* has been published in the National Archives series of Records Administration Circulars.

The October *Bulletin* of the American Association for State and Local History is devoted to Evelyn Plummer Read's description of the work of the radio committee of the American Historical Association, which for over five years has been conducting broadcasts in co-operation with the National Broadcasting Company. It is entitled: "Broadcasting History, The Story of the Story behind the Headlines."

One of the most interesting questions concerning the French settlements in the Great Lakes regions and the Mississippi valley is the effect of the French Revolution upon the French inhabitants. Canada was at this time under English rule, and Louisiana was under Spanish rule. In those French settlements already under the rule of the United States there is little evidence of revolutionary notions, although Bishop Benedict Flaget hints at some tendencies similar to those of revolutionary France among the schismatic French at Detroit in 1819. Apparently the revolutionary spirit manifested itself in Spanish Louisiana much earlier, but it was quickly opposed

by the local government. In the documents bearing on the case of Father Jean Delvaux in the New Orleans collection in the Archives of the University of Notre Dame there are indications that some active Frenchmen combined feeling against the Spanish rule with the acceptance of revolutionary ideas. Father Delvaux was accused of participating in the revolutionary movements in his parish at Natchitoches and was summarily removed from the parish and taken to Havana for trial. He protested his innocence but was ordered to be banished. In the meantime apparently he disappeared from his place of imprisonment. The testimony submitted by various witnesses contains many humorous as well as informative accounts of the influence of the revolutionary ideas on this remote French settlement in Louisiana.

Among some unpublished manuscripts in the papers of the late Father Daniel Hudson, C.S.C., for fifty-two years editor of the *Ave Maria*, is a selective history of the work of priests and sisters in the Union and Confederate Armies, prepared by David Powers Conyngham. Conyngham, who traveled with the armies as a correspondent for Horace Greeley, published a history of the Irish Brigade and was editing a New York Catholic paper at the time of his death in 1883. All efforts to trace the remainder of his papers have failed, and it is believed that they were destroyed after his death. The manuscript is entitled: "The Soldiers of the Cross: Heroism of the Cross or Nuns and Priests on the Battlefield." It was apparently submitted to Father Hudson about 1880 for publication in the *Ave Maria* or separately as a book. Father Hudson seems to have begun correcting the mechanical errors in the account but did not complete the task. Some of the chaplains were still living at the time of composition of the accounts, and the variation in the handwriting indicates that some of the narrratives were written in part by friends of the chaplains or by the chaplains themselves. Only the more notable of the chaplains received lengthy accounts. Such were Father Jeremiah Trecy, Joseph Carrier, Thomas Scully, Peter Paul Cooney, and William Corby among the Union chaplains, and Fathers Henry Gache, Charles P. Henze, and James Sheeran among the Confederate chaplains. Nine chapters were devoted to the services of the sisters in the war. The accounts are very interesting and are in part from eyewitnesses, but they are not critically prepared. In the introduction Conyngham quoted many letters of commendation for the work of the priests and nuns from Union and Confederate leaders, the originals of which would make valuable autographs if they could be found.

During the recent discussions of the Spanish Civil War few references to previous Iberian civil wars were made, except an occasional mention of the Carlists. The correspondence of James Alphonsus McMaster in the Archives of the University of Notre Dame contains many letters dealing

with an earlier Spanish civil war and the earlier Spanish Republic (1873-75) and indicates a notable parallelism between that struggle and the recent war. Of course, the devastation of modern total war, particularly that from the air, was lacking in the earlier conflict. But the confusion of political and religious issues, which even now baffles the readers of accounts of the recent struggle, was also present then. *The Freeman's Journal* was actively partisan in the wars of the 1870's. The letters of Hugh Murray, who went from Canada with troops and money to aid the Carlist cause and met his death in battle, and of his friends to the editor of the *Journal*, when read carefully in connection with the journalistic histories of recent Spain, give new meaning to some political and religious factors in the background of today's bitter controversy.

One of the prominent controversies of the late nineteenth century in American Catholic intellectual circles was that concerning the proper relationship between religion and modern science, especially on the question of evolution. Most of the scientists of the English-speaking world were not Catholics and there was a dearth of Catholic opinion on the validity of the claims of the evolutionists. Chief among the American Catholics who sought to establish the true relationship between science and religion was Father John A. Zahm, C.S.C., of the University of Notre Dame. In his Catholic Summer School lectures and especially in his *Evolution and Dogma* (1896) Zahm tried to show that there could be no real conflict between science and religion. Zahm was not a Darwinist, as some of his opponents attempted to prove; but more conservative theologians regarded his opinions as unsound. After the Italian translation of his *Evolution and Dogma* had appeared the Sacred Congregation of the Index in Rome made an adverse decision on the book, but the decree was never published because Zahm agreed to withdraw the book from sale. Whatever may be the judgments of history on the validity of Zahm's opinions, it is clear that his intentions were merely to give honorable service to the Church. He was not trying to prove evolution. Nowhere does he hold to the evolution of the soul. In regard to the evolution of the body he sought to give a factual definition of an old Catholic truism that there can be no real conflict between religious truth and scientific truth. His insistence—before the book appeared—that he have Father Augustine Hewit's opinion that he was "'safe' or not temerarious" at a time when Hewit was recognized as one of the foremost Catholic thinkers of the day, testifies to the purity of Zahm's motives.

The original of the following letter is preserved in the Paulist Archives in New York. Augustine Francis Hewit (1820-1897) was one of the associates of Isaac Hecker in the founding of the Paulist Fathers and was an outstanding critic of current philosophical and religious opinions of his day.

John A. Zahm (1851-1921) achieved success as a scientist, traveler, and writer. The controversy over evolution was, perhaps, the most important discussion of his early life. Many condemnations caricatured his theories, and it is interesting to have this letter—written to a respected friend before the avalanche of criticism came on him—in which he expresses the high motives for his labors.

THE
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
NOTRE DAME, IND.

OCT. 2ND, 95.

MY DEAR FR. HEWIT.

I enclose herewith the MSS I wrote you about & would consider it a great favor if you could return them so that I can have them in my hands by next Wednesday. The printer is clamoring for them but I did not wish to let him have them before I had your opinion of them.

They are a part of a work I propose publishing on "Evolution & Dogma" & a part too of my summer school lectures. My object is not to prove that the theories discussed are true, but that they are tenable that they are not the great bugbear they are sometimes declared to be. I wish to show that Catholics have no cause for alarm even should certain theories by which modern scientists set such store be proved to be true. I want to have your comforting opinion that I am "safe" or not temerarious.

My desire is to quiet the doubts of many Catholics who are now sorely puzzled about certain questions, to show them that there is no possibility of conflict between science & religion & that in controverted questions the Church allows her children the utmost liberty. Our people have suffered much in consequence of having presented them only the non-Catholic side of the subjects examined. I have tried to exhibit the Catholic view & shall be delighted to have your approval of my humble efforts.

Thanking you for your great kindness in looking over the MSS & hoping to hear from you *very soon*, I am,

Very Sincerely,

J. A. ZAHM, C.S.C.

The Very Rev. A. Hewit.

Elizabeth S. Kite has presented a typed manuscript entitled: "Catholic Carrols on the Potomac, 1700-1790," to the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress. The manuscript is accompanied by a genealogical chart.

The meeting of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association at Hamilton, Ontario, on September 22 and 23, rounds out the first decade of the Association's existence. The membership of the English Section of the Association was increased by one hundred and forty-five during the past year. Father Charland succeeds Father Somers as president of the whole Association. The papers read at the annual meeting will be listed in the REVIEW when they appear in print.

Under the auspices of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America a conference on the history of East Central Europe was held in New York on October 29 and 30. A dozen papers were presented on various phases of this history. The purpose of the conference is to prepare for post-war planning in this region on a basis of thorough knowledge of its historical background.

The November issues of the *Historical Bulletin* announces the appointment of John F. Bannon, S.J., as Editor and Joseph P. Donnelly, S.J., as Associate Editor. Father Bannon is also director of the department of history at St. Louis University and Father Donnelly has recently joined the department there after some years at Regis College, Denver. There are two articles of special interest to students of American church history in the November number. "Americanism," by Thomas P. Neill of St. Louis University, is a restudy of the question from the writings of some of the leading figures, particularly Klein and Martin. "Colonial Freedom of Conscience" by William L. Lucey, S.J., of the College of the Holy Cross, shows the striking contrast in freedom of conscience in American colonial charters granted during the reigns of Charles II and James II with those issued before and after the reigns of the two Stuart kings.

The Institut Français de Washington has recently issued two more of its attractive brochures. One is entitled: *Saint-John de Crèvecoeur. Qu'est-ce qu'un américain?* This essay is taken from the author's *Lettres d'un cultivateur américain.* It was written around 1774 and appeared in London in 1782 under the English title, "What is an American?" It has an Introduction written by Howard C. Rice. The second is: *Sainte-Beuve, Thomas Jefferson et Tocqueville,* made up of certain selections from Saint-Beuve's writings on Jefferson and Tocqueville with an Introduction by Gilbert Chinard. Both brochures are in French.

The September issue of *Proceedings: Vermont Historical Society* contains a short but carefully documented article by John C. Huden, state supervisor of high schools, on "Beginnings of Catholic Schools in Vermont."

Sister M. Rosalita, I.H.M., of Marygrove College is the author of a brief article entitled: "Gabriel Richard, American," in the October issue of the *Michigan Historical Magazine.* Appended to the article is a working bibliography on Richard.

A further bit of information on the early days of the University of Notre Dame is given in the October issue of the *Notre Dame Alumnus* in the article, "Father Sorin's Notre Dame," by Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., archivist of the University. It contains material from the archives on the personnel which it was not possible to embody in Arthur J. Hope's *Notre Dame. A Hundred Years,* recently published.

The *Wisconsin Magazine of History* for September contains an article on "Milwaukee's First Mass" by Peter Leo Johnson of St. Francis Seminary. He sifts the evidence for the various dates suggested between 1832 and 1837, but concludes that "the persistence of the thesis of Bonduel's first Mass in Milwaukee in 1835 must stand until greater proofs to the contrary are produced." The article is accompanied by a picture of the Durward portrait of Milwaukee's first bishop, John Martin Henni, which was presented to the Wisconsin Historical Society in 1866.

In 1868, when the Papal States were being threatened with invasion, Pius IX sent out a call to the world for Catholics to defend the rights of the Pope. Among the thousands who responded to the call at the time were 505 French Canadians. The seventy-fifth anniversary of their departure was noted recently in Quebec.

Efforts are being made in this country to aid in the rehabilitation of the National Library of Peru and the Lima Geographical Society's library, which suffered a disastrous fire last spring. A committee has been appointed by the Secretary of State to organize co-operation in the United States. The National Library of Peru desires particularly books in the following categories: (1) American classics in English, and Spanish translations of them; (2) standard reference books; (3) books on librarianship and library problems; (4) books produced by United States authors on Latin American culture—particularly Peruvian culture; (5) books on the teaching of the English language, including grammars, dictionaries, and other teaching aids; (6) files of a few selected standard periodicals such as the *Atlantic Monthly, Harpers,* and *Foreign Affairs.* The Geographical Society desires geographical works of all kinds. New or used books in good condition should be sent to the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress, marked "For the National Library of Peru." If in doubt as to whether volumes are suitable, it is suggested that you correspond with the Director of the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress, Dr. Lewis Hanke, who is serving as secretary of the committee.

The September issue of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia prints the first installment of "A Tentative Guide to Historical Materials on the Spanish Borderlands" by Francis Borgia Steck, O.F.M., of the Catholic University of America. Because of its importance as an instrument of research the editor of the *Records,* Monsignor Bernard McKenna, announces that without waiting for further installments the *Guide* has been published in book form at once. The author has worked in the field for many years and is thoroughly conversant with its literature. His contribution will be a great boon to his fellow workers.

"The Inter-American Institute" has been founded by the Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, Bishop of Kansas City, to promote a better understanding among the natives of the Western Hemisphere on the basis of their Christian tradition. The Institute will have many activities, one of which is the publication of a monthly bulletin. Information may be received by writing to the director of the Institute, the Reverend Dr. Joseph Code, 627 East 46th Street, Kansas City, 6, Missouri.

Through the courtesy of the Archives of Hispanic Culture, Library of Congress, an exhibit of photographs of Latin-American colonial religious art was recently inaugurated in the Department of Art, The Catholic University of America. At the opening of the exhibition, Dr. Robert C. Smith, of the Library of Congress, spoke briefly on the purposes of the Archives and told of its plans for the future.

The Memorial on New Mexico by Fray Alonso Benavides translated by G. P. Hammond and Agapito Rey and annotated by F. W. Hodge will be published shortly. The *Memorial* first appeared in 1630. A revision of it was made in 1634 and the manuscript was then placed in the Vatican Archives.

The Academia de la Historia de Cuba, of Havana, has just published a paper by Dr. Tomás de Jústiz y del Valle on the subject "Los centros hispano-ultramarinos".

Agustín Millares Carlo contributes a brief study on the Dominican writer, Fray Alonso de Espinosa, to the January 1943 number of *Filosofía y Letras*. Professor Millares Carlo, distinguished especially as a palaeographer, is being invited by the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress to spend a year in research as a guest of the Foundation.

Monsignor Nicolás E. Navarro, the well-known historian of Venezuela, has recently been made titular Bishop of Usula. The REVIEW extends its best wishes to the new bishop.

The National Library of Caracas has just published *Catálogo de la Exposición de Libros Bolivarianos organizada con motivo del Centenario del traslado de los restos del Libertador a Caracas, 16 de diciembre de 1942—20 de enero de 1943* (Caracas, 1943). The volume contains references to books on Bolívar in the National Library, the National Academy of History, and the house where the Liberator was born.

The *Revista Nacional de Cultura* of the Venezuelan Ministry of National Education, edited by Don José Nucete-Sardi, who several months ago appeared before the Institute of Ibero-American Studies, The Catholic University of America, publishes two articles of historical interest in its

May-June 1943 number: "José Francisco Pueblo" by Manuel Norberto Vetancourt, and "La Real Hacienda en Venezuela" by Julio Febres Cordero G.

A lecture which Fr. Ambrosio Morales, O.P., gave in commemoration of the fourth centenary of the discovery of the Amazon, is printed in the *Revista del Instituto Arqueológico* of the University of Cuzco, Peru (Año VI, 1942, Nos. 10-11, pp. 85-96) under the title of "Personalidad del V. P. Fray Gaspar de Carvajal, Capellán y cronista de la expedición del Descubrimiento del Río Amazonas 1542-1942."

Don Alejandro Fuenzalida Grandón, professor of the history of Chile and America in the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Chile, died recently.

Carlos Orrego Barros contributes a study entitled, "Don Diego Barros Arana, Rector del Instituto Nacional, 1863-1873," in the *Anales de la Universidad de Chile* (Nos. 45-46, 1943). Two studies by the late Alejandro Fuenzalida Grandón appear in the same issue: "José Toribio Medina (En su Jubileo de los 75 años)" and "Mitre en Chile."

Under the auspices of the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, Buenos Aires, Don José Torre Revello, the well-known historian, has recently published *Esteco y Concepción del Bermejo, dos ciudades desaparecidas* (Buenos Aires, 1943). Founded in 1566, Esteco played an important part in the history of Tucumán province, and remained as a barrier against the incursions of the Chaco Indians almost until its destruction by an earthquake in 1692. Concepción, another frontier settlement, was eventually abandoned by its inhabitants. Materials for the two studies were partly found in the Archivo General de Indias of Seville.

With the authorization of President Getúlio Vargas, the Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs has created a committee to examine all books and articles published at home and abroad on Brazilian history, to prepare a monthly bibliography of such works, and to criticize them from the point of view of historical accuracy.

Two rare atlases of Brazil which are reputed to be masterpieces of seventeenth-century Portuguese cartography are described at length in the January-March 1943 number of the *Revista Brasileira de Geografia* of Rio.

In the latest number of the *Revista do Instituto Arqueológico Histórico e Geográfico Pernambucano* (Vol. XXXVII, 1941-1942), are published miscellaneous documents from the archives of the famous Benedictine mon-

astery of Olinda under the title of "Manuscritos da Ordem Beneditina do Mosteiro de São Bento." Among the transcripts is an eighteenth-century account of the first thirty-five abbots of the Olinda monastery.

The prize offered by the Secretariado da Propaganda Nacional of Lisbon for the best historical work published in Portugal during the year 1942 was awarded to Snr. Costa Brochado for his *Infante D. Henrique*, a study of Prince Henry the Navigator.

In the September number of *Studies* Gerard Murphy writes an enthusiastic defense of Thomas F. O'Rahilly's thesis on "The Two Patricks" who came to Ireland (*The Two Patricks, a lecture on the history of Christianity in fifth-century Ireland*. By Thomas O'Rahilly. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies. 1942). Mr. Murphy rejects Father John Ryan's refutation of Professor O'Rahilly which appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (October, 1942). He feels that at the worst O'Rahilly's thesis is "not completely proved." In a second article in the same number of *Studies* Professor Eoin MacNeill warns very earnestly against this thesis as being built up of several probabilities posited in succession to reach the conclusion that Patrick of Armagh was not the national apostle of Ireland. Next, Father Shaw points out fallacies in O'Rahilly's skillfully presented philological argument. Finally Dr. Ludwig Bieler weakens one of the supporting arguments of O'Rahilly, viz., that according to the *Book of Armagh* Patricius was another name for Palladius. Bieler endeavors to show from the annals whence this statement was taken into the *Book of Armagh* that it is probably due to a scribal error in the source.

The thirty-ninth report of the Catholic Record Society for the year ending May 31, 1943, announced that the publication of the remaining materials in the *Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Persons, S.J.*, edited by Leo Hicks, S.J., will be published as soon as circumstances permit. During the past year the Society has issued the second volume of the *Liber Ruber* of the English College at Rome as Volume XL of its Publications. This second volume of the *Liber Ruber* was edited by Wilfrid Kelly and contains the *annales collegii* and the *nomina alumnorum* of the College from 1631 to 1783. The Society is justly proud of its ability to issue four volumes in less than four years in such trying times as the present. No general meeting of the Society is to be held until after the war, though the Council meets regularly every two months for the transaction of business. The membership at the end of the year reported was 337.

In an age when the Catholic Church in England was feeling the force of the Veto controversy and its attendant strife, there lived at the country estate of Stowe, home of the marquis of Buckingham, a curious and tragic person, Father Charles O'Conor, who had crossed from Ireland in 1799

to collate the manuscripts in the marquis' famous collection with those in the Bodleian at Oxford. From that time to July 1827, O'Conor lived the life of a scholar in the library of Stowe. The strange and pathetic metamorphosis of this priest is told from unpublished correspondence in the Huntington Library by Giovanni Costigan of the University of Washington in the October number of the American Historical Review. Father O'Conor's deference to the opinions of his host took an extreme form, even in matters of church doctrine, and before the end of 1812 he found himself suspended from his priestly functions in both Ireland and England for his published attacks on the Church in a series of letters signed Columbanus. It is a highly interesting article and exceedingly well-written. The author, incidentally, mistakes the rank of Archbishop Troy of Dublin. He was never a cardinal, as the form of address given by Professor Costigan would indicate (pp. 40, 45).

Professor Teófilo Ayuso Marazuela, who is preparing a work on the Vulgate in Spain, publishes a description of a hitherto unknown biblical manuscript in the April number of *Universidad* (Zaragoza). The codex, which he calls "La secunda biblia de Calatayud," is of the thirteenth or fourteenth century. It is less important than one of the same provenience which he described in the 1941 volume of *Universidad*. Variants with the Clementine edition are listed and analysed.

Fascicle X, 1943, of *Bibligrafía Hispánica de ciencias histórico-eclesiásticas* (Vol. XIV, Fasc. 2 of *Analecta sacra Tarraconensia*) contains the bibliography of 1940-41—a list of 1539 titles. Each item is followed by an objective résumé of its contents. This splendid instrument of research continues to be a contribution of Father Vives with the collaboration of Fathers Alamo, Dalmases, and Tarré, all of them distinguished historians.

A close examination of Machiavelli's ideas of the common good and *virtu*, as contained in *The Prince* and the *Discourses*, with an analysis of Maritain's essay on "The End of Machiavellianism," has provided Charles N. R. McCoy of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, with the materials for a thoughtful article, "The Place of Machiavellianism in the History of Political Thought," in the August number of the *American Political Science Review*. Father McCoy argues cogently for an understanding of terms as Machiavelli meant them in contrast to our traditional notion of those terms. He states: "... that virtrue as traditionally understood had any constitutive rôle in his notion of common good, or that his writings can be taken as accepting the genuine traditional sense of the virtues, are conclusions precluded by his premises on man's nature and the nature of society" (p. 638). He concludes: "The evil in Machiavelli is not, as was long commonly thought, that he favored the

rule of a despot, but it is that the rule of a republic which he favored was not different from the rule of a despot" (p. 640).

The ancient critics' view of historical writing is treated among the other literary *genres* in Father James J. Donohue's *The Theory of Literary Kinds: Ancient Classifications of Literature* (The Loras College Press: Dubuque, Iowa, 1943). It is part of a doctoral dissertation presented at the University of Iowa. The Loras College Press is rendering a service to scholarship in thus publishing the work of its faculty members.

Carlos E. Castañeda of the University of Texas, president of the American Catholic Historical Association in 1939, has been granted a year's leave of absence from his academic duties to take charge of the Dallas regional office of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

Francis Borgia Steck, O.F.M., associate professor of Hispanic American history in the Catholic University of America, was recently elected a corresponding member of the Hispanic Society of America.

Father Peter M. Dunne, S.J., head of the department of history at the University of San Francisco, is spending a sabbatical leave doing research on colonial missions in the National Archives of Buenos Aires. He plans to visit all or most of the countries of Central and South America, stopping at the Jesuit institutions of higher learning in an endeavor to further co-operation between such institutions in the Americas.

Robert E. Tschan has been appointed to the department of history in the University of Notre Dame.

Duane Koenig, who did his graduate work at the University of Wisconsin, has been appointed assistant professor of history in the University of Missouri.

The Archdiocese of Chicago observed its centennial anniversary with religious ceremonies at Holy Name Cathedral on November 14. A 96-page supplement of the *New World* was issued to commemorate the occasion.

The Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd are celebrating the centennial of their establishment in the United States this year. Their first convent was established in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1843.

On November 2, 1943, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts, marked its hundredth anniversary. Due to war conditions no formal celebration was held.

The Maryland Historical Society celebrates the centennial of its founding this month, having begun its life with a meeting on January 27, 1844.

The *Catholic Herald Citizen* of Milwaukee published a beautifully illustrated archdiocesan centennial issue on October 9. It contains a brief history of the Archdiocese.

The golden jubilee of the Church of the Gesu, in Milwaukee, which is cared for by the Jesuit Fathers of Marquette University, was celebrated by a novena of thanksgiving from November 30 to December 8, 1943. The pastors have compiled a record of the important events of the parish and of the active part this church has played in the life of Wisconsin's metropolis during the last half-century.

The Reverend Herman C. Fischer, Ph.D., who for the past thirty-five years had taught history at the Pontifical College Josephinum at Worthington, Ohio, died on September 19.

The Very Reverend Martin J. O'Malley, C.M., rector of Kenrick Seminary, died on September 29. He was for many years professor of church history in various Vincentian institutions. He was a graduate of De Paul University and received the doctorate from the Collegium Angelicum in Rome.

Documents

The Capuchin Prefecture of New England 1630-1656 (*cont.*). John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Franciscan Studies*, Sept.).—Jefferson Letters concerning the Settlement of Mazzei's Virginia Estate. Howard R. Marraro (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, Sept.).—Unpublished Mazzei Correspondence during His American Mission to Europe 1780-1783. Part I. Howard R. Marraro (*William and Mary College Quart.*, July).—The Sources of the Delisle Map of America, 1703. Jean Delanglez (*Mid-America*, Oct.).—Four letters of Bishop Henni, three to the Reverend Joseph Ferdinand Mueller, managerial secretary of the Ludwig-missionsverein, Munich, and one to Archbishop Reisach, president of the society. Peter Leo Johnson (*Salesianum*, Oct.).—Various documents concerning the history of the Colegio de Santo Tomás de Aquino of Guatemala (*Boletín del Archivo General del Gobierno, Guatemala*, June).

The secretary of the American Catholic Historical Association regrets that many of the members did not receive the programs for the annual meeting on December 29-30 in good season. The delay was due to wartime difficulties in transportation and mailing, since the programs and printed list of the membership of the Association were mailed from Washington on December 11.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

Old World Europeans: A Study in Psychology. Francis Stuart Campbell (*Thought*, Sept.).

Revolution and Competition for Power. N. S. Timasheff (*ibid.*).

Non-Catholic Liturgical Movements. General Ellard (*ibid.*).

Global Ethics and Global Peace. Donald A. MacLean (*Ecclesiastical Rev.*, Sept.).

The Paleolithic People of Palestine. Cornelius J. Connolly (*Cath. Biblical Quart.*, Apr.).

The Nicene Faith and the Legislation of the Early Byzantine Emperors. Richard M. Honig (*Anglican Theol. Rev.*, July).

Saint Benedict and Stability. John Morson, O.C.R. (*Pax*, Autumn).

The Genuine Text of Boethius' Translation of Aristotle's Categories. Lorenzo Minio-Paluello (*Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, Vol. I, No. 2).

The Rock of Parmenides: Mediaeval Views on the Origin of Dialectic. Raymond Klibansky (*ibid.*).

A New Version of Scotus Eriugena's Commentary on Martianus Capella. Lotte Labowsky (*ibid.*).

Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Petrus Helias and His Predecessors. Part. I. R. W. Hunt (*ibid.*).

Ioannis Saresberiensis Metalogicon: Addenda et Corrigenda. Clement C. J. Webb (*ibid.*).

An 'Autobiography' of Guido Faba. Ernst H. Kantorowicz (*ibid.*).

Plato's Parmenides in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Raymond Klibansky (*ibid.*).

The Friars of the Sack. Richard W. Emery (*Speculum*, July).

A *Vita Sanctae Mariae Magdalenae* (B. H. L. 5466) in an Eleventh-Century Manuscript. Jean Misrahi (*ibid.*).

An Unusual Trial under the Inquisition at Fribourg, Switzerland, in 1399. Gertrude Barnes Fiertz (*ibid.*).

John Capgrave Speaks up for the Hermits. George Sanderlin (*ibid.*).

Did the Institution of Marriage by Purchase Exist in Old Germanic Law? F. Mezger (*ibid.*).

Studies and Graduation in Medieval Universities. Ellen Perry Pride (*Social Studies*, Oct.).

Saint Irenaeus and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. John Morson, O.Cist. (*Irish Eccles. Record*, July).

Ockhamism or Nominalism and the Undermining of the Unity of Christendom. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp. (*ibid.*).

Belloc, and the Psychological Approach to History. Robert Hamilton (*ibid.*, Aug.).

The Persecutions at Alexandria in St. Denis's Letters. Philip Prime, S.J. (*ibid.*, Sept.).

Ockham's Political Ideas. Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

The Primacy of Charity in Franciscan Theology. Cuthbert Gumbinger, O.F.M.Cap. (*Franciscan Studies*, Sept.).

Early Capuchin-Franciscan Attitude towards Studies. Marcellus Manzo, O.F.M.Cap. (*ibid.*).

Some Famous Conventual Historians. Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M.Conv. (*ibid.*).

The Dispute over Franciscan Poverty, 1226-1318. Henry G. Beck (*Ecclesiastical Rev.*, Nov.).

Bread in the Form of a Penny [on the history of the offertory gifts]. Gerard Ellard, S.J. (*Theol. Stud.*, Sept.).
Raymund Martini and His Alleged Forgeries. Saul Lieberman (*Historia Judaica*, Oct.).
The 'Jewish Execution' in Mediaeval Germany. Guido Kisch (*ibid.*).
The Hebrew Heritage of Mediaeval Christian Biblical Scholarship. Herman Hailperin (*ibid.*).
Jewish Names in the Era of Enlightenment. Adolf Kober (*ibid.*).
Sous la loupe de l'abbé Henri Bremond. Rodrigue Normandin, O.M.I. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, Oct.).
Johann Adam Möhler and the Development of Dogma. Gustav Voss, S.J. (*Theolog. Stud.*, Sept.).
Music in the Lutheran Church before and at the Time of J. S. Bach. Richard Schoenbohm (*Church Hist.*, Sept.).
The Doctrinal Interests of Marius Mercator. William Bark (*ibid.*).
The Evolutionist Revolt against Classical Economics. In France—Condorcet, Saint-Simon, Simonde de Sismondi. Henry Grossman (*Journ. of Pol. Econ.*, Oct.).
Caroline Islands Dispute: 1885. Clarence A. Herbst, S.J. (*Histor. Bul.*, Nov.).

EUROPEAN

Portugal under Salazar. Lusofilo (*Month*, Sept.).
El niño en la España del siglo XIII. Jesusa Alfau de Solalinde (*Filosofía y Letras*, Apr.).
El Monasterio de San Urbez de Serrablo: Estudio histórico y diplomático de su documentación hasta la muerte de Ramiro II. Angel Canellas López (*Universidad*, Jan., 1943).
The Popes and Fascism. Luigi Sturzo (*America*, Nov. 6).
The Roman Question before and after Fascism. Luigi Sturzo (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).
The Rise of the Junkers in Brandenburg-Prussia, 1410-1653. Part I. Hans Rosenberg (*American Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).
Agrarian Regime of Pre-War Poland. George Kagan (*Jour. of Central Eur. Affairs*, Oct.).
Estonia and Her Right to Freedom. Kaarel R. Pusta (*ibid.*).
German-Polish Tariff War (1925-1934) and its Aftermath. Charles Kruszewski (*ibid.*).
Fall of the Bourbon Kingdom of Etruria, December 10, 1807. Duane Koenig (*ibid.*).
What Is Realism in Polish History? Oscar Halecki (*ibid.*).
Recent Pamphlet Literature on Central Europe. S. H. Thomson (*ibid.*).
The Studies in Nationality and Nationalism in Poland between the Two Wars (1918-1939), a Bibliographical Survey. Konstanty Symonolewicz (*Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in Amer.*, Oct.).
The Problem of National Minorities in Its Sociological Aspects. Joseph Sułkowski (*ibid.*).
The Frontier Issue—Letters [the Polish-Russian frontier question]. (*Commonweal*, Nov. 5).
The Russian Revolution Twenty-five Years After. N. S. Timasheff (*Rev. of Politics*. Oct.).
Political Factors in Movements toward Christian Unity in Seventeenth-Century Europe. J. Minton Batten (*Church Hist.*, Sept.).

BRITISH EMPIRE

The Place of Gundulf in the Anglo-Norman Church. R. A. L. Smith (*English Histor. Rev.*, July).
Confirmatio Cartarum and Baronial Grievances in 1297. Part II. J. G. Edwards (*ibid.*).

The Ellesmere Extracts from the 'Acta Consilii' of King Henry VIII. William H. Dunham, Jr. (*ibid.*).
The Office of Escheator in the City of London during the Middle Ages. Helena M. Chew (*Ibid.*).
Master Simon the Norman. F. M. Powicke (*ibid.*).
The Vicissitudes of a Lincolnshire Manor during the Civil War and the Commonwealth. F. W. Brooks (*ibid.*).
Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Vita Merlini*. J. S. P. Tatlock (Speculum, July).
Byrhtferth's *Preface*: The Epilogue of His *Manual*? Heinrich Henel (*ibid.*).
Avallon. A. H. Krappe (*ibid.*).
The Problem of Conservatism in Fifteenth-Century England. Sylvia L. Thrupp (*ibid.*).
An English Theologian's View of Roman Law: Pepo, Irnerius, Ralph Niger. Hermann Kantorowicz and Beryl Smalley (*Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, Vol. I, No. 2).
Langland and Mediaeval Functionalism. Rufus William Rauch (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).
Jocelin of Brakelond, and Medieval Monastic Life. T. Armstrong (*Australasian Cath. Rec.*, Apr.).
The English Common Law, Barrier against Absolutism. C. H. McIlwain (*American Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).
The Tragedy of Charles O'Conor: An Episode in Anglo-Irish Relations. Giovanni Costigan (*ibid.*).
The Holy Blood of Hayles and the Rood of Grace at Boxley. Archdale A. King, O.S.B. (*Pax*, Autumn).
The Real Matthew Parker. Sydney C. Carter (*Church Quart. Rev.*, July).
Gerrard Winstanley and the Early Quakers. Winthrop S. Hudson (*Church Hist.*).
The Surnames of Scotland: Their Origin, Meaning and History. Parts II and III. George F. Black (*Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, Sept. and Oct.).
The Two Patricks. Gerard Murphy (*Studies*, Sept.).
"The Other Patrick." Eoin MacNeill (*ibid.*).
The Linguistic Argument for the Two Patricks. Francis Shaw (*ibid.*).
Was Palladius Surnamed Patricius? Ludwig Bieler (*ibid.*).
Dictionary of Irishmen in France. Part VII. Richard Hayes (*ibid.*).
Irishmen in the Seven Years War. Richard Hayes (*ibid.*).
Irish Associations with Sicily. Roland Burke Savage (*ibid.*).
Centenary of William Maginn, 1794-1842. B. G. MacCarthy (*ibid.*).
Forster Archer's Tour of Ireland in 1801. P. J. Dowling (*Irish Eccles. Record*, July).
The Lay College, Maynooth. Part II. John Brady (*ibid.*, Aug.).
Doctrinal Instruction in Irish: The Work of Theobald Stapleton. Thomas Wall (*ibid.*)
The Cahil Propositions, 1629. William D. O'Connell (*ibid.*).
Ireland in the Nineteenth Century. Edward Cahill, S.J. (*ibid.*, Sept.).
Wartime Elections in Ireland. F. A. Hermens (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

AMERICAN

The Preservation of Consular and Diplomatic Post Records of the United States. Meredith B. Colket, Jr. (*Amer. Archivist*, Oct.).
Archival Terminology. Roscoe R. Hill (*ibid.*).
American Federalism and European Peace. Moorhouse F. X. Millar (*Thought*, Dec.).
Mr. Lippmann on American Foreign Policy. Charles Callan Tansill (*Thought*, Sept.).
U. S. Foreign Policy. Ross Hoffman (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).
The Wapanachki Delawares and the English: Their Past as Viewed by an Ethnologist. Frank G. Speck (*Penn. Mag. of Hist. and Biography*, Oct.).

The Nanticoke Indians in Early Pennsylvania History. C. A. Weslager (*ibid.*).
The Calvert-Stier Correspondence [*cont.*]. William D. Hoyt, Jr. (*Maryland Histor. Mag.*, Sept.).
Literary Culture in Eighteenth Century Maryland, 1700-1776. Joseph T. Wheeler (*ibid.*).
Light on the Family of Gov. Josias Fendall. Nannie Ball Nimmo (*ibid.*).
Thomas Jefferson: A Civilized Man. Charles A. Beard (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, Sept.).
Jefferson's Influence Abroad. Gilbert Chinard (*ibid.*).
The Religious Ideas of Thomas Jefferson. George H. Knoles (*ibid.*).
Thomas Jefferson through the Eyes of a New Hampshire Politician. Lynn W. Turner (*ibid.*).
Talleyrand in New England: Reality and Legend. Richard Munthe Brace (*New England Quart.*, Sept.).
Beginnings of Catholic Schools in Vermont. John C. Huden (*Proceedings of the Vermont Histor. Soc.*, Sept.).
"Americanism." Thomas P. Neill (*Histor. Bul.*, Nov.).
Colonial Freedom of Conscience. William L. Lucey, S.J. (*ibid.*).
A Study of Michigan's Place-Names. B. Phillis Armitage (*Michigan Hist.*, Oct.).
Gabriel Richard, American. Sister M. Rosalita (*Michigan History*, Oct.).
American Germans in Two World Wars. Carl Wittke (*Wisconsin Mag. of Hist.*, Sept.).
Milwaukee's First Mass. Peter Leo Johnson (*ibid.*).
The Carver County German Reading Society. Hildegard Binder Johnson (*Minnesota Hist.*, Sept.).
Some Sources for Northwest History: Early Geography Textbooks. Esther Jerabek (*ibid.*).
Missouri, Crossroads of the Nation. Wiley B. Rutledge (*Missouri Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).
Traces in Early Missouri, 1700-1804. Martha May Wood (*ibid.*).
German-American Catholics in Boston, 1840 [*concl.*]. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.*, Oct.).
Exploitation of Immigrants. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.*, Nov.).
Origin of the St. Raphael's Verein. Part I. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.*, Dec.).
The Beloved Mendicant. Moments from the Life of Father Francis Koch, O.F.M. (1843-1920) [*concl.*]. Benjamin Francis Musser (*Provincial Annals*, Province of the Most Holy Name, Oct.).
Memoirs of Marion Russell: Life in Santa Fe in the 1850's. Mrs. Hal Russell (*Colorado Magazine*, Nov.).
Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects. (*Canadian Histor. Rev.*, Sept.).
Les épidémies à Québec. Pierre Georges Roy (*Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, July).
Vodun and Catholicism. Basil Matthews, O.S.B. (*Catholic World*, Oct.).
Static and Dynamic Values in the Indigenous Past of America. Manuel Gamio (*Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).
Agrarismo, Indianismo, y Nacionalismo. Frank Tannenbaum (*ibid.*).
Intellectual Origins of Aprismo. Robert E. McNicoll (*ibid.*).
A New Interpretation of the History of America. Luis-Alberto Sánchez (*ibid.*).
The Ideology of *Hispanidad*. Bailey W. Diffie (*ibid.*).
Latin American Studies. Edwin Ryan (*Report of the National Catholic Educational Association*, Aug.).
El Rio del Espíritu Santo. Part III. Jean Delanglez, S.J. (*Mid-America*, Oct.).
José de Anchieta: "Apostle of Brazil." J. Manuel Espinosa (*ibid.*).

Alleged Spanish Grants in British West Florida. Clinton N. Howard (*Florida Histor. Quart.*, Oct.).

Miraculum: Origen, tradición y leyenda de la Feria de Santa Rita. Part IV. Lorenzo Arellano Schetelig (*Boletín de la Sociedad Chihuahuense de Estudios Históricos*, May).

Nuevos aportes sobre el primer periódico impreso en Buenos Aires. Ricardo R. Caillet-Bois (*Boletín del Instituto del Investigaciones Históricas*, July, 1941-June, 1942.).

El Papado y la revolución americana de 1810. Miguel Sorondo (*ibid.*).

Correa da Cámara [sic] en Asunción. R. Antonio Ramos (*ibid.*).

Un motin estudiantil motivado por la declaración de la Independencia de México. Mario Mariscal (*Filosofía y Letras*, Apr.).

Más datos sobre el Apóstol del Brasil. Agustín Millares Carlo (*ibid.*).

Pedro Sardinha, primeiro Bispo do Brasil. Frei Odulfo, O.F.M.. (*Rivista eclesiástica brasileira*, June).

La France et la conquête du Brésil. Fulgence Charpentier (*Le Canada Français*, Nov.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Abell, Aaron Ignatius, *The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. x, 275. $3.75.)

Adams, James Truslow, *The American. The Making of a New Man.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1943. Pp. ix, 404. $3.00.)

A Declaration on Peace and Reconstruction. (St. Louis: Central Bureau Press. 3835 Westminster Place. 1943. 10c each; $1.00 per dozen.) This is the blueprint for the post-war world adopted by the annual convention of the Catholic Central Verein of America and the National Catholic Women's Union at Springfield, Illinois, on August 23, 1943.

Allen, Harold B., *Come Over Into Macedonia.* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press. 1943. Pp. xiii, 313. $3.00.)

Anderson, Robert Bowie. (Comp.), *A Supplement to Beale's Bibliography of Early English Law Books.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. xii, 50. $2.50.)

Andrews, Matthew Page, *The Soul of a Nation. The Founding of Virginia and the Projection of New England.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1943. Pp. xiii, 378. $3.50.)

Aptheker, Herbert, *American Negro Slave Revolts.* Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, No. 501. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. 409. $4.50.)

Arciniegas, Germán, *Germans in the Conquest of America. A Sixteenth Century Venture.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1943. Pp. 217. $2.50.)

Ball, Joseph H., *Collective Security. The Why and How.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1943. Pp. v, 63. Cloth, 50c; paper, 25c.) The Senator from Minnesota here outlines in some detail the principles embodied in his Senate resolution which is at present being debated with great seriousness by the American public. It is No. 9 of the America Looks Ahead Series.

Becker, Carl L., *Cornell University, Founders and the Founding.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1943. Pp. viii, 240. $2.75.)

Benedict, Ruth, and Gene Weltfish, *The Races of Mankind.* (New York: Public Affairs Committee. 1943. Pp. 31. 10c.)

Berger, Max, *The British Traveller in America, 1836-1860.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. 239. $3.00.)

Binkley, Wilfred E., *American Political Parties. Their Natural History.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1943. Pp. xi, 407, xii. $3.75.)

Borden, Lucille Papin, *From the Morning Watch.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1943. Pp. viii, 213. $2.50.)

Brown, William Adams, Jr., *The Future Economic Policy of the United States.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1943. Pp. vi, 101. Cloth, 50c; paper, 25c.) The Eastman professor of political economy at Brown University contributes the latest addition to the America Looks Ahead Pamphlet Series issued by the World Peace Foundation. It contains nine brief chapters and a list of suggestions for further reading.

Bruun, Geoffrey, *Clemenceau.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. x, 225. $3.00.)

Chávez, Ezequiel A., *Fray Pedro de Gante.* 2 Vols. (Mexico, D. F.: Editorial Jus. 1943. Pp. 148.)

Chinard, Gilbert, (Ed.), *Sainte-Beuve, Thomas Jefferson, et Tocqueville.* (Washington: Institut Français de Washington. 1943. Pp. 43.)

Congreso Terciario Franciscano, *Conferencias Literarias.* (Mexico, D. F.: Miguel Dorantes Aguilar. 1943. Pp. ii, 375.)

Crafford, F. S., *Jan Smuts.* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co. 1943. Pp. xi, 322. $3.50.)

Crouse, Nellis M., *The French Struggle for the West Indies, 1665-1713.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. 324. $4.00.)

Curti, Merle, *The Growth of American Thought.* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1943. Pp. xx, 848. $5.00.)

Dooley, L. M., S.V.D., *God's Guests of Tomorrow.* (New York: Scapular Press. 1943. Pp. 111. $1.75.)

Earle, Edward Mead, (Ed.), *Makers of Modern Strategy. Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1943. Pp. xi, 553. $3.75.)

Faulkner, Harold Underwood, *American Economic History.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1943. Pp. xxiii, 184. $3.75.) This is the fifth edition of the text, the first entire resetting of the volume since 1931 which gave "the author a chance to rearrange or consolidate certain of the material, to make numerous deletions, particularly in the early part of the book, and to add new and pertinent information" (p. xxiii).

Fischer, Eric, *The Passing of the European Age.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. xiii, 214. $2.50.)

Gallahue, Edward E., *Some Factors in the Development of Market Standards.* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 1942. Pp. xiii, 209. $2.75.) This is Volume 9 of Studies in Economics of the School of Social Sciences of the Catholic University of America. The monograph of Dr. Gallahue gives particular attention to food, drugs, and other household wares in the development of the general subject. Two historical chapters introduce the work, one devoted to standards and the market in the Middle Ages and the second to the modern period.

Gavigan, John J., O.S.A., *The Syntax of the Gesta Francorum.* (Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America. 1943. Pp. 102.) This doctoral dissertation of the Department of Latin of the University of Pennsylvania has been published in the Supplement to *Language, Journal of the Linguistic Society of America.* Father Gavigan teaches at Villanova College.

Goodrich, L. Carrington, *A Short History of the Chinese People.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1943. Pp. xv, 260. $2.50.)

Gragg, Florence Alden (Trans.), *The Commentaries of Pius II.* Books II and III. Smith College Studies in History, XXV, 1-4. (Northampton, Mass.: Smith College. 1942. Pp. 115-291. $2.00.)

Greene, Evarts Boutell, *The Revolutionary Generation, 1763-1790.* Vol. IV of A History of American Life Series. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1943. Pp. xvii, 487. $4.00.)

Grigassy, Julius, *A Textbook of the History of the Church of Christ for Greek Catholic Parochial Schools.* (McKeesport, Pa.: Prosvita-Enlightenment Printing Press, 1943. Pp. 114.)

Haffert, John Mathias, *From a Morning Prayer.* (New York: Scapular Press. 1943. Pp. xiii, 151. $2.00.)

Hawkins, Robert Martyr, *The Recovery of the Historical Paul.* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press. 1943. Pp. vii, 292. $3.00.)

Henry, Sister Rose de Lima, *The Late Greek Optative and Its Use in the Writings of Gregory Nazianzen.* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 1943. Pp. xix, 108. $1.25.) Sister Rose de Lima's monograph is Volume LXVIII of the Patristic Studies of the Catholic University of America.

Holborn, Louise W., *War and Peace Aims of the United Nations, September 1, 1939-December 31, 1942.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1943. Pp. xv, 730. $2.50.)

Howard, Joseph Kinsey, *Montana. High, Wide, and Handsome.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1943. Pp. vi, 347. $3.00.)

Huth, Hans, and Wilma J. Pugh, (Trans. and Eds.), *Talleyrand in America as a Financial Promoter, 1794-96*. Vol. II, *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1942. Pp. vii, 181. 65c.)

Iswolsky, Helen, *Soul of Russia*. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1943. Pp. xiii, 200. $2.75.)

Johnson, Gerald W., *American Heroes and Hero-Worship*. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1943. Pp. 284. $3.00.)

Johnson, Peter Leo, *Centennial Essays for the Milwaukee Archdiocese, 1843-1943*. (Milwaukee: Centennial Committee. Pp. vii, 177.)

Kelty, Mary G., and Sister Blanche Marie, *Modern American Life*. (Boston: Ginn and Co. 1943. Pp. vii, 444, xvii. $1.44.) This volume is a companion to *Early American Life* issued previously in the American Life. A Series of Histories for Catholic Schools. It is illustrated and has integrated well the Catholic participation in American life from the days of the trans-Allegheny migration to the present war.

Kemble, John Haskell, *The Panama Route, 1848-1869*. Vol. XXIX of the University of California's Publications in History. (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1943. Pp. viii, 316.)

Klingberg, Frank J., *Main Currents in English History*. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co. 1943. Pp. ix, 209. $1.65.)

Laistner, M. L. W., *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1943. Pp. x, 168. $3.00.)

Leduc, Gilbert F., *Washington and "The Murder of Jumonville."* (Boston: La Société Historique Franco-Americaine. 1943. Pp. 111, 235. $2.25.)

Macmillan, Margaret Burnham, *The War Governors in the American Revolution*. Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, No. 503. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. 309. $3.50.)

Magner, James A., *Latin American Pattern*. (Cincinnati: Catholic Students' Mission Crusade. 1943. Pp. 98. 88c.)

Maryknoll Mission Letters. (New York: Field Afar Press. 1943. Pp. viii, 55. 50c.) This little book is the first installment of the volume of Maryknoll letters for 1943. It contains excerpts from letters of the missionaries from both the Far East and South America.

Mildred, Sister Mary, S.S.A., (Trans.), *The Apostle of Alaska, Life of the Most Reverend Charles John Seghers*. (Paterson: St. Anthony Guild Press. 1943. Pp. xi, 292. $2.50.)

Mott, Frank L., *Jefferson and the Press*. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1943. Pp. 65. $1.00.)

Mueller, Sister M. Magdeleine, *The Vocabulary of Pope St. Leo the Great*. (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 1943. Pp. xviii, 269. $2.75.) This monograph is Volume LXVII of the Patristic Studies of the Catholic University of America.

Nevins, Allan, and Louis M. Hacker, (Eds.), *The United States and Its Place in World Affairs, 1918-1943*. (Boston: D. C. Heath and Co. 1943. Pp. x, 612. $3.25.) Fourteen historians and economists have co-operated to produce this over-all picture of the relations of the United States to world affairs in the years between the two world wars. The volume contains fourteen Maps, Suggestions for Further Reading, and an Index.

Nichols, Jeannette P., *Twentieth Century United States*. Century Historical Series. (New York: D. Appleton Century Co. 1943. Pp. xiii, 435, lxxi. $3.50.)

Nichols, Roy F., and Jeannette P., *A Short History of American Democracy*. (New York: D. Appleton Century Co. 1943. Pp. xvii, 626, lxx. $4.00.) The Nichols' have abridged and combined here their three earlier volumes while retaining the customary apparatus of maps, illustrations, bibliographies, etc. This volume will interest those instructors charged with the teaching of American history to service men in the various educational programs of the Army and Navy.

O'Donnell, George E., (Ed.), *St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook*. (Overbrook, Philadelphia: St. Charles Seminary. 1943. Pp. ix, 401.)

Paden, Irene D., *The Wake of the Prairie Schooner*. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1943. Pp. xix, 514. $3.00.)

Peace and War. United States Foreign Policy, 1931-1941. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1943. Pp. xxi, 874. Cloth, $2.00.)

Purcell, William J., (Ed.), *Catholic Pittsburgh's One Hundred Years*. (Chicago: Loyola University Press. 1943. Pp. xvi, 271.)

Rice, Howard C., *Saint-John de Crèvecoeur, Qu'est-ce qu'un Américain?*, (Washington: Instiut Français de Washington. 1943. Pp. 53.)

Robinson, Jacob, et al, *Were the Minorities Treaties a Failure?* (New York: Institute of Jewish Affairs. 1943. Pp. xvi, 349. $2.00.)

Ross, Malcolm Mackenzie, *Milton's Royalism. A Study of the Conflict of Symbol and Idea in the Poems*. Vol. XXXIV of the Cornell Studies in English. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1943. Pp. xiii, 150. $2.50.)

Rutkowska, Sister M. Neomisia, *John Tyssowski*. (Chicago: Polish Roman Catholic Union. 1943. Pp. 80. 50c.)

Salvemini, Gaetano and George LaPiana, *What To Do With Italy*. (New York: Duell Sloan and Pearce, Inc. 1943. Pp. xxii, 301. $2.75.)

Schilpp, Paul Arthur (Ed.), *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore*. Library of Living Philosophers, Vol. IV. (Evanston: Northwestern University. 1942. Pp. xv, 717. $4.00.) This is the fourth of a series of extensive critiques of eminent philosophers still living by their contemporaries to which the philosopher himself makes extensive reply. The previous volumes covered the philosophies of Dewey, Santayana, and Whitehead. It is an excellent plan, but it has met with only indifferent success to the present. Moore, however, has been much more successful than others in the reply he makes to his nineteen critics. The former Cambridge professor also writes a very illuminating autobiography. It is forty years since George Edward Moore startled the philosophical world with his "Refutation of Idealism," in the English periodical, *Mind*, the same year in which his well-known *Principia Ethica* appeared. Moore's own particular expression of realism here receives review from practically every angle. The Aristotelean influence in that realism make his work of particular interest to all Scholastics. It is to be regretted that the editor has never seen fit to invite a Scholastic to present an essay on any of the philosophers who have thus far passed in review in this notable series. Nor does announcement of volumes in prospect indicate any change from what appears to be a quite definite policy. (Charles A. Hart.)

Science, Philosophy, and Religion. (New York: Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion. 1943. Pp. xix, 438.) As indicated in the title this is the third collection of papers read in as many years at the Conference. It cannot be said that it is any more successful than its predecessors. At the first conference Mortimer Adler asked the Conference to declare their attitude on the character of both philosophy and religion. If these disciplines were simply collections of opinions constantly beset by doubts and never arriving definitely at any certainty, then they could not make any very distinct contribution to the democratic or any other way of life. He insisted as between contradictory systems one must be true and the other false. Adler was not well received by the majority of those conferring. The Scholastic philosophers then present, however, could quite appreciate his viewpoint. By the time of this third symposium these latter have just disappeared. They are not represented by a single paper. Monsignor John A. Ryan makes two brief comments on two papers dealing with economic and political themes. Generally speaking, the same vague obscurantism still hovers over the product of this meeting of American minds for a purpose so laudable. It is the naturally-expected result of confused philosophy upon which the product is predicated. (Charles A. Hart.)

Sellers, James Benson, *The Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702 to 1943*. James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. XXVI, No. 1. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1943. Pp. vii, 325.)

Shaw, Albert, *International Bearings of American Policy*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1943. Pp. x, 492. $3.50.)

Sheppard, Lancelot C., *The English Carmelites*. (London: Burns Oates. 1943. Pp. viii, 115. 6/.)

Spellman, Francis J., *Action This Day*. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1943. Pp. xiii, 256. $2.75.)

Stancourt, Louis Joseph, *Her Glimmering Tapers*. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1943. Pp. 180. $2.00.)

Steck, Francis Borgia, O.F.M., *A Tentative Guide to Historical Materials on the Spanish Borderlands*. (Philadelphia: Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. 1943. Pp. 106.)

Stuart, Graham H., *Latin America and the United States*. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co. 1943. Pp. viii, 509. $4.00.)

Swisher, Carl Brent, *American Constitutional Development*. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1943. Pp. xii, 1079. $4.50.) Thomas P. Stran, professor of political science in the Johns Hopkins University, presents this textbook in constitutional history under the editorship of Edward McChesney Sait of Pomona College. The volume is well-documented and has a brief Bibliographical Note and a thorough Index.

Usher, Abbott Payson, *The Early History of Deposit Banking in Mediterranean Europe*. Vol. I. Harvard Economic Studies, Vol. LXXV. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. xx, 649. $5.00.)

Vlekke, Bernard H. M., *Nusantara. A History of the East Indian Archipelago*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1943. Pp. xv, 439. $5.00.)

Warren, Sidney, *American Freethought, 1860-1914*. Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, No. 504. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1943. Pp. 257. $3.25.)

Weiant, C. W., *An Introduction to the Ceramics of Tres Zapotes Veracruz, Mexico*. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1943. Pp. xiv, 144. 78 Plates. 40c.) This is Bulletin 139 of the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of American Ethnology.

Winthrop Papers, 1630-1637. Vol. III. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1943. Pp. xl, 544. $5.00.)

Wish, Harvey, *George Fitzhugh, Propagandist of the Old South*. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1943. Pp. ix, 360. $3.00.)

CONTRIBUTORS TO ARTICLES AND MISCELLANY

RICHARD PATTEE, president of the American Catholic Historical Association for 1943, studied at the University of Louvain and took his graduate training at the Catholic University of America. Mr. Pattee taught for a number of years in the University of Puerto Rico and is the author of a study entitled *Gabriel García Moreno y el Ecuador de su tiempo* (Quito, 1941). He is a lecturer in Latin American history in the Catholic University of America and director of the University's Institute of Ibero-American Studies. He is at present on leave of absence lecturing at the National University in Mexico City.

W. STANFORD REID did his undergraduate work at McGill University and took the doctorate in 1941 at the University of Pennsylvania. From 1939 to 1941 he held a Harrison Graduate Fellowship at the University of Pennsylvania. He is the author of *The Church of Scotland in Lower Canada* (Toronto, 1937), and at present is sessional lecturer in history at McGill University.

HOWARD R. MARRARO is assistant professor of Italian in Columbia University. He took his doctorate at Columbia in 1932 after a year as a Cutting Traveling Fellow in Italy, 1930-1931. He is the author of *American Public Opinion on the Unification of Italy* (New York, 1932). His latest work is a translation of *The Memoirs of the Life and Peregrinations of the Florentine Philip Mazzei, (1739-1816)* (New York, 1942).

REVEREND JOHN TRACY ELLIS is associate professor of American church history in the Catholic University of America, managing editor of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, and secretary of the American Catholic Historical Association. Father Ellis is the author of the study, *Cardinal Consalvi and Anglo-Papal Relations, 1814-1824* (Washington, 1942).